

The New _____ **INTERNATIONAL**

March • 1943

NOTES OF THE MONTH

War Labor Board

Ehrlich and Alter

THE ROAD TO SOCIALISM

Political Resolution of the Workers Party

National and Colonial Problems

By Max Shachtman

Whither Zionism? Whither Jewry?--II

By Karl Minter

Archives

•

Book Reviews

•

Correspondence

SINGLE COPY 20c

ONE YEAR \$1.50

Boost Our Press!

Two hundred and fifty new subscribers for *The NEW INTERNATIONAL*, one thousand new subscribers for *Labor Action*, by June 15! The readers and friends of both papers are mobilizing for a joint drive to raise the banner of socialist thought and socialist action higher than ever before, in the very face of a difficult world situation and the rise of reaction. They are backed by the enthusiastic approval of the hundred or more delegates and visitors to the recent conference of Workers Party activists.

The magnificent progress made by *Labor Action* during the past year gives us good reason to believe that *LA* will hold up its end of the drive. But *The NEW INTERNATIONAL* quota cannot, unfortunately, be simply left to the initiative of even its most devoted readers. Each one seems to labor under the delusion that the magazine appears exclusively for his personal and private political education, and will continue to appear as long as his personal and private need exists, regardless of such mundane matters as rising printing costs, etc.

Let us explain, without going into further detail, that such is *not* the case. An organ of socialist education must be constantly expanding its sphere of influence or it fails in its purpose. It cannot allow itself to shrink to the proportions of a private discussion bulletin of its editorial board. *The NEW INTERNATIONAL* is proud of its position as the outstanding organ of socialist education in America. But its influence needs to be extended in a large way.

An entirely new *push* will be required to bring in the 250 subs that will mean so much for the continued publication and improvement of our magazine. "Two hundred and fifty new subscribers by June 15th" is *not* just another slogan for talking purposes only; it is the *only* way of giving the *NI* a wider sphere of influence.

PLAN A LOCAL DRIVE FOR NEW SUBSCRIBERS!
CANVASS LOCAL *LABOR ACTION* SUBSCRIBERS!
BRING SPECIAL ARTICLES IN THE *NI* TO THE
ATTENTION OF LOCAL UNIONS, NEGRO GROUPS,
ETC.!

BOOST THE *NEW INTERNATIONAL*!

NEW INTERNATIONAL: \$1.00 for six months.
\$1.50 for one year.

NEW INTERNATIONAL

AND *LABOR ACTION*: \$1.00 for six months.
\$1.75 for one year.

NEW INTERNATIONAL

114 West 14th Street

New York, N. Y.

Name.....

Address.....

City..... State.....

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

Vol. IX

No. 3, Whole No. 73

Published monthly by the New International Publishing Co., 114 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y. Telephone: CHelsea 2-9681. Subscription rates: \$1.50 per year; bundles, 14c for five copies and up. Canada and foreign: \$1.75 per year; bundles, 16c for five and up. Entered as second-class matter July 10, 1940, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: ALBERT GATES

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Notes of the Month:

CRISIS OF THE WAR LABOR BOARD.....	67
MURDER AS A POLITICAL WEAPON.....	69
By A. G.	

Articles:

THE ROAD TO SOCIALISM	
<i>Political Resolution of the Workers Party</i>	70
SMALL BUSINESS IN DESCENT	
By Sam Adams	75
NATIONAL AND COLONIAL PROBLEMS	
By Max Shachtman	76
WHITHER ZIONISM? WHITHER JEWRY?—II	
By Karl Minter	82

Archives of the Revolution:

WHAT DOES SPARTACUS WANT?	
By Rosa Luxemburg	87

Books in Review:

A NEW LITERARY CRITIC	
By R. F.	91
PRINCELY POTPOURRI	
By W. Amadeus	92
GERMANY FROM UNDERGROUND	
By Alfred Freeman	92

Reviews in Brief

FINANCES AND THE WAR	
By A.	93
A WAR LABOR PROBLEM	
By G.	93

Correspondence:

A LETTER	
By Freddie Forest	94
A REPLY	
By Reva Craine	95

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

VOLUME IX

MARCH, 1943

NUMBER 3

NOTES OF THE MONTH

Crisis of the War Labor Board

For some time now the War Labor Board, composed of representatives of labor, industry and "the public," has been threatened in its position as an arbiter of the living standards of the American workers. The essential reason why it was threatened, almost from the start, with a desperate existence and the danger of dissolution resided in its position as the principal ruler of wage increases the workers should get to meet an admitted rapidly rising cost of living. At least, this was the formal task of this body. Actually, and it has been so stated on numerous occasions, the aim of the WLB was to keep wages within a definite limit, no matter to what heights the costs of living might rise, in order thereby to effect a barrier against inflation and to deflate the mass demand for consumer goods.

By taking on the task of meeting the danger of inflation through a destruction of the living standards of the working class, the WLB has acted as an agency of the government on the one hand and of the monopolistic industrialists on the other, for their rulings against wage increases, or for limited wage increases which never matched the actual rises in the costs of living, have redounded to the benefit of the bourgeoisie. The net result of the WLB actions has been to bring about an increase of the total profit of the bosses.

This is not all. The WLB has procrastinated to such an extent in its deliberations that as many as six thousand cases have been charged as awaiting decision from this august body. Here again, the bosses suffer nothing from the delay. The workers in the shops, faced with the burden of meeting rising prices, suffer from the inability of the board to act with the dispatch required of its position.

In general, the WLB has remained stoically unmoved by the sufferings of large sections of underpaid workers, whose only resort, under the system created by the Administration, is this selfsame board. The professed principle upon which the board was constructed, to keep wages in line with prices and thus maintain an equilibrium, proved in practice to be the swindle it was expected to be. Prices, despite ceilings established in Washington, have far outstripped any wage increases which have been granted by the board. Moreover, and this is most important, the head of the OPA, Prentiss Brown, has publicly acknowledged that it is not within his power really to control prices, and that despite all controls established by his body, prices have and unquestionably will increase beyond all ceilings set for them. This, unfortunately, has been the lesson driven home to the workers long before Mr. Brown uttered his profound observation,

A Formula and the Cost of Living

It is acknowledged that the general rise in prices has been about 21 per cent. Some quarters have estimated it as 36 per cent. In addition, there are many intangible ways in which the costs of living have risen that are not reflected in the price indices. Inferior quality goods, smaller portions of foods sold, substitutions, are additional ways in which the costs of living are actually raised. These intangibles are by no means small items. In the case of meat, for example, a New York *World-Telegram* report of an estimate made by a meat packer showed that 17 per cent of the meat today is being acquired and sold on the black market. The black market, however, operates in all fields.

Rising costs of living reflected in the high prices charged for food, clothing, shelter and other necessities of life, in a situation where the administrative head of price control admits that he cannot actually prevent rising prices, has been met by the now infamous Little Steel formula, granting wage increases to the limit of 15 per cent, of the War Labor Board. All certified cases for wage increases which come before this board are decided by this standard of measurement. Geographic location, actual local conditions, specific outrages in the costs of living in one area or another, are blithely ignored by the gentlemen seated on the WLB. Whenever and wherever they rendered a decision permitting an increase in wages to conform to the 15 per cent limit of the formula, the workers have merely reduced their *wage cut*, for the granting of the full limit in that formula or bringing a specific wage within its range has merely meant that the disproportion between the wages received and the cost of living (using the 21 per cent figure) was reduced to 6 per cent.

More recently the labor representatives on the WLB have come into increasing conflict with the rest of the board over the granting of even the increases permitted by its formula, but especially in two cases where the body refused to grant increases despite the urgency of the needs in these two instances—the packing-house workers and the West coast airplane cases. They have demanded a rehearing of the cases and a revision of the board's action.

The situation has been highly intensified as a result of the meeting between the coal operators in the bituminous field and the United Mine Workers, led by John L. Lewis. For some time now, Lewis has been waging a one-man campaign against the War Labor Board and its Little Steel formula. He served notice many weeks ago that he would demand a two-dollar-a-day increase for bituminous coal miners to meet their cost of living. Furthermore, he declared that he would not ask for reference of this demand to the WLB because the board had demonstrated its inability, incompetence and prejudice in the handling of labor cases; that its Little Steel formula, permitting no wage increases above 15 per cent, was a travesty in face of the wild rise in the costs of living, and because the board was anti-labor in its majority, incapable of giving labor a fair deal.

This has been his unwavering position up to the present meeting of the union and the soft coal operators. He took the occasion of these wage negotiations to blast the WLB once more, and made specific and pointed references to the chairman of the board, William H. Davis, as "a rapacious, predatory Park Avenue lawyer on the loose in Washington against the American worker."

Lewis Forces the Issue Publicly

It is the attitude of John L. Lewis toward the War Labor Board which has brought to a head the conflict between it and the whole labor movement. The CIO and the AFL, for objective and subjective reasons of their own, have joined in, though separately, with the objections similar to those raised by Lewis, though not with his demands. Precisely when the meeting of the coal operators and the miners' union takes place, the AFL and CIO members of the WLB, and the two organizations officially, demanded that the board "scrap its Little Steel formula" and establish a "realistic wage policy."

The AFL demanded, in addition, that the WLB declare itself independent of any "person or governmental agency" endeavoring to control its actions. This has reference to James F. Byrnes, Economic Stabilization Director, who has sought strict adherence by the board to its formula. It also refers to Prentiss Brown, OPA Director, who is vociferous in his opposition to any revision of the Little Steel formula.

The meeting of the WLB which considered this proposal of the labor bloc, also had before it the latter's proposal for a rehearing of the packing-house case and the airplane cases. Significantly enough, Wayne L. Morris, representing the public on the board, supported the demands of the labor bloc against Chairman Davis, also representing the public, who defended them in common with the industry members. But the fight in the War Labor Board is not and cannot be confined to its quarters. It has roads which lead in many directions, not the least of which is to the White House itself.

The denunciations of the WLB following Lewis' declarations have grown to include many sections of the labor movement. We have already cited the actions taken by the AFL and CIO representatives on the board. But prior thereto, Philip Murray, CIO president, had already proposed the drafting of a new wage policy, while he characterized the Little Steel formula as "inadequate and unfair." The International Ladies Garment Workers Union, in demanding wage increases, pointed out that the increases already granted to it did not meet rising costs, but merely compensated for the decreases which the union had voluntarily accepted in 1937 and 1938. In New York City, the Allied Printing Trades Council announced that it would call a conference of all AFL unions in the city for the purpose of developing a program to meet the "mounting cost of living."

R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile Workers, rejecting the formula of the WLB, declared for "a realistic formula recognizing an advance of at least 30 per cent in the cost of living since January, 1941, so that the workers through their unions can commence to bargain now for comparable increases in wages." As a matter of fact, a resumé taken of the number of unions actively forcing the issue of wages, would run into scores.

Pressure of the Worker

The iniquitous position taken by the anti-labor WLB aroused such resentment among the millions of rank and file workers that it compelled the labor bureaucrats to speak out

somewhat forcefully on the issue of wages. The workers have a nose for these matters. They know that one-third of the nation lives under sub-standard conditions. The position of these millions has not been altered in the slightest by the WLB. They know that the price-fixing machinery in Washington is a patent failure. They know that their economic position has been materially worsened by heavy taxes, which cruelly eat into their living standards. But throughout it all they note how the bosses, the financiers, the industrialists, the brokers and the merchants are fattening themselves with huge profits granted or permitted them by a government which stands in the way of an improvement of their miserable conditions. They know that any wage-saving achieved by the bosses goes into the bosses' pockets in the form of increased profits. But they also know that wage increases, if granted, for the most part will be paid by the government, because war contracts are granted on a cost-plus basis—the government pays all costs and then adds a more than comfortable *plus* for the industrial magnates—to *guarantee* their profits!

When Lewis declares that the mine workers are not interested in any of Roosevelt's "utopias" but want "a more favorably 'divvy' as along the road we go," he is merely echoing the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the workers. The restlessness and restiveness of the American workers is quickly felt by the labor bureaucrats, who have been quick to respond to the pressure of the workers. The Administration feels the pulse of the masses through its intimate associations with the officialdom of the labor unions. And Roosevelt, who has keen instincts, feels this better than most of his associates. Undoubtedly he understands something of the importance of the mass dissatisfaction of the workers, otherwise he would not have intervened in the present dispute between the operators and the United Mine Workers by saying to reporters that the struggle of the UMW for increased wages must not be prejudged!

But just at the time that Roosevelt made this statement, Prentiss Brown warned the WLB that it must not violate the Little Steel formula, else the whole anti-inflation program of Washington would be fatally endangered. James F. Byrnes likewise added his voice of authority to warn the WLB that it must adhere to the principle it adopted long ago.

What Does Roosevelt Plan?

It is difficult, at the time of this writing, when the over-all struggle on this question is first unfolding, to foresee all of its possible ramifications. Is Roosevelt merely playing politics, preparing for 1944, by publicly insinuating his sympathy for the workers, to finally declare his inability to do anything about it? Or is he preparing to save the face of his WLB, Economic Stabilization Board and the OPA? Is he preparing a concession to the workers and, if so, what kind of a concession does he have in mind? These things we shall certainly know in a very short time. The termination of the miners' contract on April 1 will bring matters to a head.

If Roosevelt goes ahead and revises the formula of the WLB, then the WLB in its present form is a dodo. A reorganization, or the formation of an entirely new body, is inevitable. If he backs up the board, then the labor representatives, already committed to a fight against its present principle, will very likely withdraw from it, and again the question of its reorganization would necessarily arise. The WLB is on the spot, but its demise would be a boon to the workers, for its authority and the legal powers vested in it have given it

the power to stand as an obstacle in the path of the American workers.

What Roosevelt does, however, is largely dependent upon the vigor and power displayed by the labor movement. If he feels that the present outcries of the labor leaders are merely face-saving gestures before their rank and file, he will, of course, do nothing. But if he should find that the labor leaders themselves are helpless before the urgent pressure of the ranks, he will find it necessary to make some important concessions to the workers.

The key to this situation is held by the workers. If they suffer defeat in the present struggle, it will make their future battles only more difficult. Should they, however, succeed in forcing the issue and obtaining their essential demand, the strength and power of the workers will be considerably enhanced. And this is of inestimable value in the face of the rising tide of reaction, whose headquarters are now divided between the portals of big business and the congressional halls in Washington.

Murder as a Political Weapon

The Stalinist crimes against the international labor movement have not ceased with Hitler's invasion of Russia. Nor has preoccupation with the greatest war in Russian history eliminated murder as a political weapon in the labor movement by the infamous régime of Cain Stalin. This was once more brought to light with the announcement, a few weeks ago, that Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter, leaders of the Jewish Workers Party of Poland, seized by the GPU when the Red Army invaded Poland, were secretly executed as agents of Hitler's Gestapo!

The mystery of this case was cleared up when William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, announced to the press that, in response to his inquiries over an extended period of time, he was informed by the Russian Ambassador, Litvinov, of the execution of the two Jewish socialists. Green had, on the "advice" of the State Department, kept this information to himself. War exigencies, don't you know!

Following Green's announcement, many things were disclosed, all of them pointing to the utter perfidiousness of the Kremlin régime. A mere chronological detailing of the circumstances following the arrests are sufficient to properly assess the nature of this latest Stalinist frameup.

Ehrlich and Alter were seized four years ago. Their arrest undoubtedly was one of the results of the Hitler-Stalin pact. They were "left" social-democrats who, throughout their lives, retained adherence to the general principles of Marxism. They were confused centrists rather than revolutionary internationalists. But, guided by their own concepts of the socialist struggle, they were in direct conflict with Stalinism and all that its reactionary nationalist doctrines signify. Ehrlich's and Alter's attempt to organize resistance in Warsaw to the German invader and their general anti-fascist activity in that particular period, led to their incarceration by the GPU. Furthermore, they were arrested as part of Stalin's policy to destroy the whole pre-war Polish labor movement as inimical to his interests.

The announcement that Ehrlich, a member of the Labor and Socialist International, and Alter, a member of the execu-

tive committee of the Trade Union Congress, were arrested by Stalin, led to the formation of many international committees to seek their release. In this country, a committee headed by William Green, Philip Murray, Dr. Albert Einstein and Raymond Gram Swing, repeatedly intervened without result. Wendell Willkie, while in Moscow, pleaded in vain with Russian officials for their freedom. The intervention of Eleanor Roosevelt and countless other personages brought not the slightest concession from Stalin's hangmen.

Material aid was sent to Ehrlich and Alter, but there was no visible evidence that the food and money ever reached their proper destination. It was quite possible that they were already executed when this aid was sent. Certainly they were already dead while many pleas for their release were made. But the Kremlin, by calculated silence, gave no sign as to the fate of its prisoners.

The first release which announced the execution of Ehrlich and Alter stated that they were murdered more than a year ago. This was later denied by Litvinov, who volunteered the information that they were executed only four months previous to the information given in a letter to William Green. No one will really know exactly when the deed was done. But that can only shed light on the cynicism of the murderous régime as it is reflected in this particular case. The thing to be remembered is the deed itself.

The execution of Ehrlich and Alter followed the typical GPU pattern. According to Szmul Zygielbojm, one of the leaders of the Jewish Workers Party of Poland, and a member of the Polish National Council, they were kept in prison for nearly two years without formal charge and with no apparent disposition of their case. In July, 1941, six weeks after the German invasion of Russia, they were court-martialed under the charge of "working for the forces of international fascist reaction." It was under this charge that they were first sentenced to death. While awaiting execution in the death cells of Moscow and Saratov, they were informed that their death sentence had been commuted to ten years' penal servitude.

But, in September, 1941, following the signing of the Polish-Russian pact, they were released with the apologies of the government. A terrible mistake had been made, said the agents of the GPU. The charges against them were false! Ehrlich himself had described what happened following their release. They were given residence "in the best hotel in Moscow and a complete set of clothes, and were placed under medical care. Most important of all, we were assured that the action taken against us was a mistake and that our collaboration in the fight against Hitlerism is a necessity both with regard to the interests of the USSR and to those of the Jewish nation and Poland."

Following their release and the apology, the Kremlin sought their services. A Colonel Wolkowsky of the Commissariat of the Interior, proposed to them that they should organize in Russia a Jewish committee to fight Hitlerism on a world scale. Ehrlich and Alter agreed to this since, in general, they found themselves sympathetic to the Russian war against Germany.

According to their agreement with the government, Ehrlich was to act as chairman of this committee, Alter as secretary, and a Russian artist named Nichols as vice-chairman. The head of the GPU, Beria, invited Ehrlich and Alter to a special conference at which they discussed the work of this committee. The latter were then invited to send their material and proposals to Stalin, which they did. It was necessary

to do this, they were advised, in order to get official sanction from the "good father" in the Kremlin.

But, according to Stalin, it was after their release that they began agitating for a peace with Hitler!—at the very time they were being wined and dined in Moscow and in the midst of the organization of the previously mentioned Jewish committee to fight Hitlerism! And at the very time that they were presumably agitating for this peace, they were evacuated, together with all other government officials and workers, to the temporary capital at Kuibyshev.

Last December, according to the latest evidence, they were called to pay a visit to the Commissariat of the Interior. They never came back!

Why then were Ehrlich and Alter murdered? The reasons are several, although it is impossible to know all the facts at this time. Stalin was taking revenge on two anti-Stalinist socialists! Stalin is preparing the seizure of Poland if the United Nations are victorious in the war. Ehrlich and Alter, by their past, are committed to an "independent Poland," which, whatever its character, Stalin is determined to prevent. Their murder was, therefore, insurance for the future. It was a po-

litical murder.

In an effort to make the execution more palatable, it is necessary for Stalin to besmirch these men, to create an amalgam. Thus, Ehrlich and Alter, two Jewish labor and social-democratic leaders, are linked to Hitler and the German Gestapo! The *Daily Worker*, following the lead of its GPU master, called them "pro-Nazis." One can expect almost any day that the "intuitionist" ex-Ambassador Davies, as William Henry Chamberlain called him, will include this incident in a revised edition of *Mission to Moscow* and in the motion picture version of the book. To complete the "realism" of this charge, he might even show that Ehrlich and Alter received money from the Gestapo in a synagogue. This is all that is needed to complete the Stalinist frameup against these two men.

Ehrlich and Alter, leaders of a movement and a people which have been butchered by the Nazi barbarians, opponents of fascism to their last days, were murdered by Stalin on the charge that they were German agents. Need anything more be said?

A. G.

The Road to Socialism

A Political Resolution of the Workers Party

The developments of the war in its fourth year make it possible to reiterate our analysis of the war and to extend it.

The past half year has witnessed the rude upsetting of the myth of German fascist irresistibility and invincibility created in the early stages of the war. Both in Russia and in Africa, the Axis has suffered heavy blows, from which it cannot easily or quickly recover. Neither Berlin nor Rome speaks any longer of an early victory, in so far as they speak of victory at all. The Axis leaders now hold forth to the masses the perspective of averting defeat by standing firmly at their defensive positions, regardless of the cost in men and material, regardless of the suffering. First step in achieving this modest goal is a new, super-totalitarian mobilization of human resources. Next step is to accustom the masses, the Germans primarily, to the idea of foregoing any thought of enjoying the fruits of past conquests until the Axis has succeeded in outstaying the Allies, which means in practice an indefinite postponement. A decisive military victory such as the Axis originally expected in the war is now more than ever a blood-stained fantasy.

The extremely limited character of the Hitlerite "dynamism" which so terrified and disoriented all sorts of people in the first two years of the war, emphasizes the comparative ease with which the Axis régimes could be exploded out of power, right in their own homelands, by a revolutionary opponent, able and anxious to appeal sincerely to the desire for peace, security and plenty which animates the populations of Germany and Italy as much as it does of the countries of the Allies. But that is precisely what democratic imperialism is neither able nor willing to do. The significance of its military victory over Germany is not lost upon the people of that country. In fact, Hitlerism is able, particularly in periods of military setbacks, to exploit the fears of the population with the greatest cunning and to the full, for it has no difficulty in

pointing out what would be the concrete effects of a victory by the other side, precisely in terms of the people's desire for peace, security and plenty. The fall of Hitlerism as a result of an internal collapse therefore does not seem to be imminent, even though it is absolutely inevitable at a later stage in the development of the situation.

The decline—if not the complete disappearance—of prospects of a military victory by the Axis, has produced a corresponding rise in confidence that a military victory by the Allies is not only sure but may be expected soon. Such conclusions are, fundamentally, not more substantially warranted than were the widespread early opinions about an imminent Axis triumph. The military position of the Allies has undoubtedly been strengthened at several highly important points; in any case, nowhere has it been weakened in the past six months. The tremendous weight of American economic power is beginning to make itself felt, and, provided there is no drastically unfavorable turn in the casualties suffered from submarine warfare, it will be felt more heavily in the period ahead. But there is a long and bloody road between halting any further progress of the already far-advanced Axis or even between cutting off some of its far-away extremities, and striking the final fatal blows which could bring the military struggle to a conclusion. Hitler is not only still in physical possession of the whole continent (except for a handful of doubtful "neutrals"), but also still has a highly-trained armed force as large as, if not larger than, that of the Allies, has the very substantial economic resource of the continent at his command, plus the organizing skill of a modern imperialist power and a complete absence of scruples about reducing millions upon millions of subjected peoples to the position of mechanized slaves.

On the other side of the world, Japanese imperialism still remains basically unshaken, and differs from Germany largely in that it has not yet suffered a fraction of its losses in the war.

It has not even had its Stalingrad or its Tripoli, and to drive it out of one little island at the outermost extreme of its Pacific conquests required exactly one-half a year of unrelenting struggle. Also, just as the Allied, primarily the American economic-productive position has improved with relation to Germany, so has the economic-productive position of Japan improved with relation to the United States and England. With the military and political instruments at the disposal of the Allies, victory in the field over the two main partners of the Axis is not to be counted in weeks, or even in months, but rather in years—if the unwarranted assumption is made that a military victory by *either* side will take place before the revolutionary forces of the masses burst out, to put an end to the war. As for the prospects of an Axis victory, they are now, practically speaking, out of the question.

Politics and the Military Situation

Furthermore, while the military position of the Allies has been improved in recent months, their political position has grown worse to a much greater degree. The relationship between these two positions is of decisive importance in the question of revolutionary socialist perspectives for Europe and the rest of the world. What the ruling class in every warring country speaks of as "morale" is the extent to which the masses accept, either actively and enthusiastically or tacitly and cynically, its leadership, its war program and its war aims, and therefore the extent to which the proletariat foregoes its own class position, class interests and the struggle to defend them, in the name of "national unity." When, therefore, the ruling class speaks of a "declining morale" or a "low morale" in the country, it means that the active or passive support that the masses have given its leadership and its war program—and by that token to the war itself—is diminishing; which means, in turn, that the proletariat is becoming more disposed to press its own class program free from the myth of "national unity," i.e., subordination to the ruling class and its interests; which means again, in turn, that the proletariat is moving in the direction of reestablishing its class independence, with all the revolutionary implications in that process.

The deterioration of the Allied political position is directly connected with the improved military position. By deteriorated political position, two things are meant. First, is the worsening of political relations among the partners in the Allied camp. Second, is the worsening of the political standing of the Allied camp in the eyes of the masses, affecting each of the partners to one extent or another, but not uniformly.

Several examples may be given of the second case:

The improvement of the Allied military position in the Southwest Pacific and on the India-Burma frontier means, at the least, a postponement of an immediate Japanese invasion threat to Australia, at one end, and India, at the other. Breathing a little easier now, British imperialism does not hesitate to dispense with even that half-polite attitude it showed the Indian nationalists about a year ago when it feared imminent attack by the Japanese advancing through Burma. The people of India cannot help but perceive that the imperialists are "soft" or brutally contemptuous, i.e., their usual selves, in almost direct dependence upon the degree to which their imperialist positions are militarily imperilled.

Similarly in China. England and the United States have graciously agreed to abandon their extraterritorial privileges in the Chinese ports and cities no longer in Chinese hands. Apart from this empty gesture, Anglo-American imperialism

is now holding the Chungking régime to the position of door-keeper till the day when substantial imperialist forces can enter the country. Chungking is given the absolute minimum of material required to prevent Japan from overrunning the rest of China, and if more material is sent in the coming period it will be only because that absolute minimum has not been reached. However, material in sufficient quantities to engage the Japanese invader successfully may be expected in China only when the international military position of Anglo-American imperialism is such as to enable it to send into the country enough armed forces of its own to use, or direct the use of, the material in a way that will assure victory over Japan by the benevolent imperialist masters of China, but not by a China free of all imperialist domination. Meanwhile, the Chinese national bourgeoisie, in so far as it is represented by Chungking, plays the rôle of Horatio at the bridge for Washington and London. More and more Chinese cannot fail to see that their country has been reduced in the war to the position of vassal in the camp of imperialism. As a result, the political prestige of Anglo-American imperialism has unmistakably declined among the people. Increasingly, the masses will see that there is only one road to the achievement of genuine national independence—a complete break with their imperialist "friends" and the national bourgeoisie that serves them.

Similarly, in France and the rest of Europe as a result of the African victories of the Allies. The lessons of the Darlanist-Giraudist policy are undoubtedly trickling down, slowly and steadily, into the fighting, underground groups and movements on the Nazi-ruled continent. There cannot be the slightest doubt that the illusions about the character of the war conducted by democratic imperialism have been anything but strengthened as a result of what has happened following the African landings. How many of the millions among whom these illusions were prevalent are now saying to themselves: We wanted an Anglo-American victory in the hope not only of defeating the German oppressor but also of settling accounts with our own "native" Lavals, Peyroutons and Quislings and other fascists and reactionaries; but is the hoped-for victory going to mean that they will impose upon us a dozen different Peyroutons differing only in national origin? Undoubtedly, great numbers are now thinking in these terms, and this fact signifies the first step in the direction of complete independence from all imperialist war camps, that is, a big step in the reawakening of revolutionary class consciousness among the European masses.

Russia's Part in the War

Similarly with regard to the rôle that Russia is playing in the war. Here the reaction among the masses is not as simple as in the other instances, but much more complicated. Nevertheless, the trend is in the same, or rather in a parallel direction. With the first substantial (though by no means yet conclusive) victories over the Germans, the Stalinist bureaucracy is regaining its self-confidence. With regained self-confidence comes the release of repressed appetites and ambitions, and increased boldness in revealing aims and claims which the exigencies of yesterday's utter dependency upon the Anglo-American partners made it expedient to keep in the background. Obviously inspired by Moscow, trial balloons are already being sent up to see what the reaction would be to the demand that the bureaucracy will most certainly put forward, as soon as the military and political situations permit it, for its own imperialist, expansionist claims, in Eastern and South-

ern Europe and in the Orient. To think that, in case of an Allied victory, the Stalinist régime will modestly declare that it has driven the invader off its territory, as of August, 1939, and that it is quite content with the restoration of those territorial boundaries, is to be utterly preposterous. The prestige of the Stalinist bureaucracy (also, of the Russians "in general," so to speak) has risen greatly among wide sections of the people, as a result of the generally unexpected powers of resistance and even counter-offensive that the Russian army has shown. But the feelers put out to test the reaction to Stalinist annexationist demands in Europe are already having unfavorable effects upon the prestige of Stalinism. The effects vary and will vary in different countries, depending upon the level of consciousness and degree of class independence of the working class, upon the economic and political situation of the peasantry, etc. Thus, in the more backward agricultural countries of Eastern and Southeastern Europe, especially in those wherein hangover of feudalism press down heavily on the agricultural population, the prestige of Stalinism has not declined but has even tended to rise, although even in these countries the trend is not by any means uniformly favorable to the resurrection and extension of Stalinist influence. However, in the more advanced countries, and especially in those countries where the labor movement has not been depressed by a series of heavy class defeats, the trend is and will generally be in the other direction, namely, the rejection of Stalinism and growing disillusionment with its "working class" and "emancipatory" pretensions.

Closely connected with the rôle of Russia in the war is the first case mentioned above, namely, the deterioration of the political relations among the Allies. In adversity, that is, during the period of the war when the tide was running in favor of the Axis, the Allied partners bent over backward to impress the masses not only with their democratic aims and intentions but above all with the fact that these aims were held in common, that the Allied were "United Nations." In other words, with their backs to the wall, they did all they could to repress the irrepressible antagonisms dividing each against all, or at least to push them into the shaded background. As the tide begins to run in their favor, the antagonisms rise once more to the surface, for their is not the same need as before to keep them submerged. The examples are numerous.

There is the scarcely muted struggle between British and United States imperialism for control of the various allies, sub-allies and potential allies, as part of the struggle for control of the terms of the "peace" that is to come once victory is assured. The sordid, unprincipled jockeying for position, the coolness with which yesterday's democratic-protesters seek, beg for and consummate alliances with the most sinister and discredited cliques in the camp of reaction in general, and even in the camp of fascism in particular, has not escaped the attention of the masses, who have never been over-enthusiastic about the war. But above all it has led to increasingly open rifts among the Allies. England and the United States vie with each other for exclusive patronage of the French clique which is to govern the France of tomorrow. Less spectacular but nonetheless lively are the rifts and wire-pulling and behind-the-scenes machinations in other countries, with other émigré or resident groups: Poles, Czechs, South Slavs, all sorts of Austrian, Italian, German and other pretenders and claimants to sub-power after the hoped-for Allied victory.

At the same time, both England and the United States face an ally who does not hesitate to exploit differences between both of them, but follows as much of an independent policy as

any of the partners in either of the two big war alliances tries to follow. The relationships with this partner, Russia, go from bad to worse (from the standpoint of Anglo-American imperialism) as the military situation goes from good to better (from the standpoint of Stalinist imperialism), and vice-versa. As the fear of a German victory diminishes, the demands of the Stalinist régime grow in scope and intensity of presentation, and the apprehensions of Anglo-American imperialism mount correspondingly. Moscow wants the annexation of at least part of Finland, the three small Baltic countries, Eastern Poland, Bessarabia and parts of Rumania, at least part of Manchuria, not less than three of the five northern provinces of China—or a "protectorate" over these lands which is either the equivalent of annexation or a prologue to it—to say nothing of "access to the Mediterranean" at Turkey's expense, "access to the Persian Gulf" at Iran's expense, etc. This is not only indicated by the course of Russia's foreign policy, but has already been made fairly clear by the apologists and spokesmen for the Stalin régime in the U.S.A. The achievement of this program would make Russia a formidable rival to the capitalist-imperialist powers on the European continent and in Asia. This fact is realized, beyond a doubt, both in Washington and in London; and also in Ankara, which requires constant assurances about Russia from her allies, in the Polish émigré-government circles, which are split right down the middle on the question of Russia's post-war demands, in those Finnish circles which want to withdraw from the war with Russia but fear the consequences, and elsewhere.

British and American Relations

England's aim in the war is the preservation of the British Empire from disintegration, the restoration of a balance-of-power on the European continent in which no country shall become so strong that England can be dispensed with as supreme arbiter of the Old World, and the elimination—if not the elimination then the mutual cancelling out—of the threats to its power emanating from imperialist Germany and Stalinist Russia. The elimination or reduction of the power of its American imperialist rival is recognized by England as Utopian, at least for the whole next period.

The aim of the United States in the war is the establishment of its hegemony not on this or that continent alone, but throughout the world. This time it looks upon the perspective of world hegemony as far more real than in the First World War. The change in reality of perspective—in the mind of American imperialism—is symbolized by the fact that, unlike 1917-1918, American armed forces now occupy posts on every continent of the earth, and not just in Europe.

Neither England nor the United States can think of realizing its war aims if Russia is to achieve the goal which grows clearer in outline every day. To dictate the "peace" terms, however, requires winning the war, and that in the most literal sense of the word. Bourgeois commentators in this country are already making pointed and not heavily-veiled references to the situation and its presumed remedy. Winning the war means nothing less than putting into the field of actual and direct combat an armed force capable of dealing the decisive blow against Germany. This does not mean Africa or Iceland; it means millions upon millions of soldiers, with corresponding equipment, fighting at or near the very heart of Europe itself, that is, of Germany.

To think that Anglo-American imperialism will turn this

task over to Russia (assuming the latter is in a position to perform the task!) is completely fantastic. To win the war against Germany, and to reap most of the harvest of the victory—that is, to reduce the Russian share of the harvest to the lowest fraction—the invasion of Europe is mandatory upon Anglo-American imperialism, and there is no alternative. In this case, as in the case of all decisive military developments, political considerations will be decisive. If the situation permits two opinions on the matter, then only in relation to the important *political* question of where the invasion line will start and whither it will move. It is questionable if, in the present circumstances, the Stalinist régime is quite as vigorous in demanding a “second front” as it was about a year ago. But if it is to come, and come it must, there is no doubt that Stalin would infinitely prefer that the Anglo-American invasion be launched through France, Belgium, Holland or at most Norway—that is, as far from the Russian “sphere of influence” as possible—than through Turkey-Bulgaria or Crete-Greece, that is, along a line that would in reality drive a wedge between Russia and Germany, and place the Anglo-American partner in a better “physical” position to deny the Russian partner its claims to the booty of Eastern and Southern Europe.

Thus the situation dictates, above all to the United States, the policy of active, direct physical intervention of the continent for the purpose of coming to grips with the German military power, and all that flows from this policy and is required for its execution. Required first of all is an army of tremendous size. Some of the petty-bourgeois politicians in the United States cannot see why a ten-twelve million man army is needed to win the war, in view of the “manpower available from our Russian and Chinese allies.” They do not understand that what is involved is not primarily winning the war “for the Allies,” but winning the war and the “peace” for American imperialism, whose ambition is the domination of the entire world, and not an equal sharing of this domination with other powers.

The “United Nations,” therefore, are united on two points and on nothing else. First, they jointly oppose a victory by Germany and Japan. Secondly, they are united in their awareness of the threat that the coming proletarian revolution presents to all of them, and in their determination to prevent it from materializing or, if that proves impossible, to crush it when it does materialize. On every other important political question, and particularly on the question of their respective or joint war aims, they not only display a hostility among themselves, but a hostility that is bound to grow with every military advance they make either as separate nations or as allies. The important fact, which so completely belies the rhetorical pretensions of the “democratic” Allies, will also be steadily assimilated by the masses of the people, and the necessary lessons drawn from it.

This whole analysis may be summed up, so far as the political perspectives in Europe are concerned, in the posing of the question: Which is more likely to come first, the decisive military defeat of the Axis by the Allied powers, or the first of a series of revolutions on the continent? The most important signs point to the second alternative. There is no serious ground for pessimism about the world revolution, for it can truly be said about the period ahead: “There will be no lack of revolutionary situations” and of revolutions, regardless of what form the uprising of the masses may initially take (“national revolutions,” “democratic revolutions,” etc.). Hitler’s “New Order” is criss-crossed and ripped by the violent hatred which the masses feel toward the new régime. Hitler’s “New

United Europe” has been established in such a manner as to revive in the most intense manner all sorts of dormant and even outdated national-separatist passions, which emphasize the reactionary character of Hitlerism all over again in that they signify a further postponement of the indispensably needed economic and political unification of the continent. These nationalist passions, however, are most often a superficial translation of the deep-seated yearnings of the masses, the worker in the first place, for a fundamental and progressive social change. No one understands this better than the Axis leaders on the one side and the leaders of the Allies on the other. They can be counted on to play their counter-revolutionary rôle in the days to come in Europe. But they will have occasion to play it only because a revolution will confront them that threatens their very social existence.

America Fights for World Hegemony

No power is involved in such world-wide and decisive commitments in the war as the United States. Victory over Germany alone, to say nothing of victory in the Pacific area, requires a mobilization of forces such as the United States never before witnessed or even dreamed of. In analyzing this mobilization and its consequences in the country, it must be borne in mind that the political and economic changes that have taken place in the U.S.A. in the past year or two are the product of only half—if that much—of the reorganization and mobilization that must finally be accomplished if America is to fulfill its “manifest destiny.” In other words, complete conversion to total war economy on a scale practiced by Germany or Russia has not yet been attained in the United States, although feverish efforts continue to be made in that direction. This means, further, therefore, that the blows and deprivations suffered by the working class in the first period of the war will be redoubled in the coming period.

One by one, the phenomena produced by Hitlerism’s transformation of German life for war purposes, and so uproariously and condescendingly sneered at by bourgeois democrats and reformists in this country, are being made part of the daily life of the United States. Hitler’s promise of a “people’s car” disappeared; in the United States the real people’s car disappeared. Hitler’s promised war against finance capital was transformed in life into a war to extirpate small business and all middle-class elements for the exclusive advantage of the super-monopolists. In the United States, the war requirements have given hectic force to the process of ruining the urban middle classes (to a much smaller but nonetheless important extent also the rural middle classes) which grows more violent the louder Mr. Wallace sings of the future American middle-class paradise. Rationing goes hand in glove with the black market, just as it did and probably still does in Germany; and no newspaper or statesman has denounced the Goeringian formula of “Cannon, not butter,” for more than a year—nor is likely to do so for more than another year.

Fascism is the road to totalitarianism in economy and politics. It is likewise true that progress in the direction of such totalitarianism is paving the road to fascism.

In the United States, this has already manifested itself in the first stages of the process. The first stages are marked by the following: inability of the bourgeois-democratic régime to satisfy the demands of any of the classes; growing irritation of all classes; increasing tendency to wipe out the middle classes and the growth of reactionary moods among them; growth of reactionary moods and their open expression by the bourgeoisie; further decline in the parliamentary system and wide ex-

tension of government by decree; spread of anti-Semitism.

All these tendencies could be seen reflected politically in the last national elections. The bourgeoisie did not hesitate to put forward its most reactionary candidates, running on openly anti-New Deal and reactionary programs without being universally rebuked by the electorate. In addition, isolationism, i.e., bourgeois-reactionary "opposition to war," did not prove at all fatal to those candidates who had espoused it before Pearl Harbor. The middle classes generally voted for conservatism and reaction, in protest not so much against the war "as such" as against the consequences of the war as they have already felt them. The working class, at least wide sections of it, absented themselves from the polls because in most cases there was not enough political difference between contenders for office to arouse the class interest of the workers, even though that class interest is still in an early stage of development. The result of the elections was an enormous encouraging of bourgeois reaction, and the most reactionary Congress in generations of American history.

Yet, nothing could be more erroneous than to conclude from these facts that the perspective of working-class struggle and development in the United States is dark. A contrary conclusion is not only possible, but is indicated by many considerations.

American Labor in the War

First, it is gradually becoming clear to the innermost consciousness of the people that the carrying on of this war will require stupendous outlays, in terms of money, of physical effort, of sacrifice of lives, and of sacrifice of standards of living. Not even the first serious steps can be taken toward winning world imperialist hegemony on the basis of the comparatively insignificant efforts and contributions made by the United States in the First World War.

Secondly, the bourgeoisie, emboldened by its successes in economic and political life, and its appetite whetted by the possibilities of further successes in both spheres, has embarked, as is evident from the trends of the new Congress alone, on an all-out policy of fettering the labor movement and of unloading the full, enormous war burden on the shoulders of the workers. The concessions already made by a criminally capitulatory labor leadership have only stimulated reaction's demands for more blood.

Thirdly, the New Deal, i.e., bourgeois reformism, while it is far from crushed or nullified, is nevertheless in steady retreat before the pressure of bourgeois reaction. The Democratic Party machine is almost entirely out of hand today, not only in most of the Southern states but in the cardinal state of New York. If it does not come out openly for the destruction of all that remains of the New Deal, it is for three reasons: 1. it is accomplishing the equivalent of its aim piece-meal; 2. it cannot, at least not yet, break publicly with the nominal leader of the party and the war leader of the country; 3. it fears the loss of all labor support, with the consequent possibility of an independent labor party, which would guarantee its overwhelming defeat in the coming elections.

In face of this growth in the strength and self-confidence of bourgeois reaction, the working class has repeatedly demonstrated its militant mood, its readiness to take class action, its unwillingness to retreat without a fight and confidence that if it does fight it will not have to retreat. *The American working class is neither in a depressed nor a defeated mood.* Neither has it been swept off its feet by chauvinistic propa-

ganda or by the demagogical appeals for "national unity," i.e., for docile acceptance of the insults and the iniquitous demands of capitalist reaction. It is still "for the war," in the sense of wanting to have victory on the Allied side and not on the side of the Axis, but at the same time it is steadily losing whatever faith it had in the imperialist aims of the war. It has already shown in many ways that it refuses to have the war burden loaded upon its shoulders, that it refuses to let the war be used as a convenient pretext for the strengthening of the economic and political power of the capitalists at the expense of the economic and political power of the workers. In spite of the "no-strike" pledge one-sidedly and cravenly given by the union leaders, the workers have not hesitated to use the strike weapon in the extreme cases—and they have been numerous—when they could get their demands granted in no other way. In spite of the bars put up by the capitulating leadership, the workers have broken through in many significant cases. Where this leadership has made the slightest gesture in letting down these bars, the workers have responded with an alacrity and spirit that reveals the true mood of the workers at present.

We reject the false and essentially tail-endist and opportunist theory that the American workers are not in motion, are in a state of apathy, and will not move in defense of their rights and standards in the coming period. The contrary is the case. The extent of the higher-wages-movement of the American workers, the persistency with which they press their demands in the face of blustering capitalist threats, official government admonitions and belly-crawling labor leaders, their obvious readiness to engage in aggressive mass action to resist the capitalist offensive, is positively sensational, considering the war situation. The movement is in fact so strong and widespread that even the most conservative of labor leaders find themselves compelled to appear at the head of the movement for higher wages (which is still essentially a movement for *maintaining* wages at previous levels, considering the high tax rates and the rise in living costs). Whoever argues that the American workers are today at rest, that they are not moving, will not move in the near future, and cannot be made to move by militant leadership and guidance; whoever argues that "when" they move, "we will not stand in their way," deserves a position as a benevolent trade union bureaucrat, but does not deserve the name of revolutionary socialist.

The very boldness and thoroughness of reaction's avowed campaign to fetter and overload labor, to wipe out its economic and political gains, must produce a counter-reaction among the workers. Signs of this counter-reaction are multiplying. They can be seen not only among the rank and file workers but even in the labor bureaucracy. It does not dare stand by idly while its very basis is wiped out or crippled beyond easy repair. Neither can it take the risk of at least sections of the workers jumping over its head and taking matters into their own ranks, i.e., taking a radical, independent course. The workers demand *action* to stop the inroads being made into their living standards and their political rights. Given the fact that the road to economic action has been studded with great formal obstacles by the bourgeoisie, and the fact that "Roosevelt's party" is in the hands of open reaction (a fact recognized by the workers in the last election in the form of mass abstention from voting, except in New York, where they gave a sensational vote to the A.L.P.) creates a strong groundwork for the formation of an independent labor party, that is, for working-class *political* action.

Tasks of the Workers Party

The main tasks of the party in this situation are clearly indicated. The agitation and propaganda of the party, be it in its press, from its platforms, or through the activities of individual members, may be summed up most briefly in five slogans: "Soak the rich for the war," "Workers' control of rationing and production," "Win back the right to strike," "Form a Labor Party," "For a Workers' Government." The platform of the party which appears regularly in *Labor Action* is only an amplification or supplementation of these slogans.

By "Soak the rich for the war," we mean to convey the idea that it is only right that the "rich" (the bourgeoisie) should pay for the war, first, because it is their war after all and second, because they can, in general, carry economic burdens more easily than the workers, and third, because the reduction of the economic strength of the bourgeoisie diminishes their capacity to promote political reaction, i.e., fascist and semi-fascist movements. We mean to convey, even more concretely, the idea that the tax burden must be lifted from the workers and put upon the bourgeoisie.

By "Win back the right to strike," we mean to emphasize labor's urgent need of regaining the indispensable weapon which its leaders surrendered to the war machine, leaving labor at the mercy of the capitalist and the labor boards dominated by them. Without the *right to strike*, labor is in the poorest position to enforce its legitimate and at present still extremely modest demands about wages. Without that right, labor cannot effectively meet the capitalist offensive, cannot effectively resist the organized efforts to unload the main burden of the war upon its shoulders.

By "Workers' control of rationing and production," we mean to crystallize the justified suspicions that the workers feel toward the rationing regulations and machinery set up by the government, and to crystallize it in a progressive, pro-

letarian sense. There can be no democratic control and regulation of the badly needed institution of rationing commodities unless the workers, the working-class housewives, the working-class organizations are in charge. They represent the only force sufficiently interested and sufficiently organized to put a stop to iniquities, injustices and to the black market. However, control of rationing is inseparably connected with control of production. At present, the masses must take the word of the capitalist politicians, bureaucrats and industrialists. The masses cannot even decide *what* must be rationed, because they do not have an inside picture of production and they cannot have it without control of production.

By "Form a Labor Party" we mean to emphasize the fundamental, revolutionary idea that the working-class must break completely its dependency upon and association with the bourgeois parties, and form a *class* political organization of their own whose ultimate aim is to put the working class in power. All that the party has said before about the reactionary consequences of the failure of labor to form a powerful, mass working-class political organization of its own is true twice over today. Party propaganda and agitation must be redoubled on this score.

By the slogan "For a Workers' Government," we mean to convey our adherence to the idea of the need and desirability of a revolutionary reorganization of society, of a genuine new order of peace, plenty, security and freedom, to the idea that not even the first step can be taken in this direction until the working class, as a class, has taken state power into its hands. In turn, the formulation of such a slogan requires, on our part, the constant association of the idea of a government of, for and by the workers with the ideal of socialism, for to hide this inseparable connection would mean appearing before the workers as opportunists and tricksters who, at best, are willing to lead the workers forward step by step without educating them politically.

Small Business in Descent

More Facts on a Major Phenomenon

Small businesses, especially those engaged in non-war production, were fated for extinction the moment American economy began seriously to convert industrial plant and conserve raw materials for war production. The total nature of this war and the fact that American industry must supply the material war needs of all the members of the United Nations makes it impossible to view the problem of small business and non-essential manufacturers on the basis of the experience of World War I. The present problem is basically different, because the demands of the present war are of such character and magnitude that currents and tendencies of 1914-18 are no longer a barometer for measuring probable developments in industry in this war.

For all the protestations of the liberals and the helpless pleas of the little business men and manufacturers are in vain. The bourgeois war economy would be strangulated if it endeavored to throw any substantial crumbs, in the form of war contracts, to the multitude of small enterprises which exist in this country. Small industry cannot possibly compete with the huge monopolies which have received the bulk of the billions of dollars' worth of war contracts issued from Wash-

ington. Moreover, it is no accident that the control in the issuance of these contracts is in the hands of the big corporations—without them, the war Administration could not possibly extend the conversion of production into a complete war economy. They are indispensable; the small businesses and manufacturers are, from the point of view of the war, a dispensable luxury.

Several weeks ago, William J. Enright, in a review of a Dun & Bradstreet report (*New York Times*, February 28), wrote: "Despite a sharp decline in bankruptcies this year, the death rate of business concerns is exceeding births by a wide margin and a net loss in establishments far in excess of 100,000 was forecast for 1943 by business executives last week."

Formation of new firms, dissolution of old ones constantly take place under the most normal economic conditions. Even now, in the midst of the war, many new firms are organized to capitalize on contracts arising from war needs. In a large number of instances, these new firms are merely subsidiaries and auxiliaries of already existent enterprises. But often they are new, representing a shift of business men engaged in non-war industries to raw material and manufacturing industries

directly or indirectly related to the new production.

The present rate of business births and deaths is in no way normal; as a matter of fact, it is extremely abnormal. While the formation of new firms to take advantage of the gravy dished out with war contracts are usually war-duration enterprises, the dissolution of thousands and thousands of old firms has a permanent character. Their elimination only fortifies the position of the monopolist firms which absorb the machinery, plant and raw materials of the old firms. Once eliminated from the economic scene, these old firms will find it exceedingly difficult to return in the event the war is successfully terminated for American capitalism. The monopoly combines will have made certain that these difficulties will become almost insurmountable.

According to the figures of Dun & Bradstreet (they vary slightly from official figures and those of other agencies) there were, at the end of January, 1942, 2,194,100 establishments in existence. At the end of January, 1943, this total had dropped to 2,106,000, or a net loss of 87,500 concerns. Since there were only 9,400 bankruptcies in this same period, companies which went out of business on such grounds were only about ten per cent of the total number of business failures.

For the past ten years, or mid-way in the existence of the New Deal, the organization of new companies exceeded the expiration of existing businesses. This trend was sharply reversed in 1942 and for the first time in this ten-year period the death of business enterprises exceeded the creation of new ones. The total number of failures over new firms for each two-month period in 1942 ran between 15,000 and 18,000 firms. The 254,021 new companies which were formed during

the past year were more than offset by the death of 312,604 old companies.

An interesting aspect of this trend is that the percentage of dying companies in excess of new enterprises, increased. Thus, for the two-month period of December (1942)-January (1943), 28,700 new firms were organized, but 46,800 concerns went out of business. On the basis of this development, the death of small enterprises threatens to reach a new high in 1943. During this year, the completion of the war economy will be witnessed with a general tightening up of the loose ends, a more categorical organization of raw materials, manpower and production for the war. The estimate of the Department of Commerce that about 300,000 firms would go out of business during 1943 is considered conservative by Enright. It will be closer to 400,000. This means that the "obliterations" of old firms in excess of new formations will be far larger than 100,000 and probably closer to 200,000.

Exceedingly significant social implications will follow this tendency, which results in a strengthening of monopoly capitalism and a weakening of economic strength of a large section of the middle class. Many of the latter will find themselves reduced to the ranks of the proletariat, to become fully absorbed by it. Others will find their way toward complete reaction. Whatever the political ramifications of this economic development may be, the immediate effect of this change is to sharpen the division between the classes. For a more extended discussion of this problem, we refer our readers to the article, "The Middle Class in Crisis," contained in the October, 1942, issue of *The New Internationalist*.

SAM ADAMS.

National and Colonial Problems

A Reply to Shamefaced Critics - Concluding Article

Under the conditions of the dominating and all-determining imperialist World War, the struggle of the colonial and semi-colonial countries for national freedom cannot be carried on under the leadership of the national bourgeoisie. This struggle, which rose and fell in one country after another before the outbreak of the World War, can be re-launched only under the leadership of the proletariat, and by virtue of that fact, launched on a higher social and historical plane.

The dependency of the colonial bourgeoisie upon one imperialist power or another is inherent in the fundamental relationships between the two. When the rivalry between imperialist powers amounts to nothing more than what Lenin used to call a "contributory element of no great importance" in a colonial struggle against one of these powers, it is mandatory upon all revolutionary socialists to support the colony against the imperialist oppressor even if the former is led by the native bourgeoisie. When, however, the rivalry between imperialist powers reaches the point of open hostilities, of war, and the war extends to the colony, then the dependency of the colonial bourgeoisie upon one of the imperialist powers promptly manifests itself in the *integration and subordination* of the colony by the imperialist war. The colonial bourgeoisie—by virtue, we repeat, of its inherent relationship to modern imperialism—acts as the subject-ally of one or another imperialist camp. A war in alliance with imperialism is an impe-

rialist war, said Lenin categorically and rightly. To support the colony under these conditions means to support one of the imperialist camps in the war.

The ring of the all-embracing imperialist war can and will be broken. The just war of the colonies against foreign oppression can and will be launched again, and again receive the support of revolutionists everywhere. But *only* if the leadership of the colonial struggle is taken over by a genuinely anti-imperialist class, the proletariat.

Greatly summarized, these are the views of Lenin, repeated by him time and again in the First Imperialist World War, accepted generally by the international Marxian movement after the war, and confirmed all over again by the events of the Second World War. They were reiterated by the author in the preceding articles of this series, directed against the Cannonites, who have not only abandoned these views but have publicly denounced them as petty bourgeois.

Why the Cannonite position of continued support to China is a variety of social-patriotism has been set forth in the earlier articles. How it is related to their position on India and on the national question in present-day Europe is what this article aims to show.

*See articles on India and China by Wright and Morrow in various issues of the *Fourth International* during 1942, as well as my articles on the same subject in *The New Internationalist* of June, September and October, 1942. The author asks the reader's indulgence for the delay in concluding the series; other tasks more urgently demanded attention.

In the September, 1942, issue of his magazine, Morrow launches one of his characteristic attacks upon us on the subject of India. It is introduced with a pontifical homily on the essence of petty bourgeois radicalism which, he expertly assures us, "is phrasemongering with no thought that the words will ever have to be followed by deeds.... Shouting and doing, Marx noted, are irreconcilable opposites...."

"With the moderation of doers [continues Morrow], Lenin and Trotsky declared the working class, by its own methods, should support any colonial struggle, even if it were led by the colonial bourgeoisie," and so on and so forth.

The conclusion, as the French say, imposes itself; it is obvious; it is elementary, inescapable, and beyond serious debate. There is on the one side a long line and tradition of *doers*, beginning with Lenin and Trotsky and ending, for the time being—no false modesty!—with Morrow; and on the other side a line of petty bourgeois, radicalistic *shouters* represented—the truth is the truth—by Shachtman. Now let us see just what it is that this well known Man of Action does, and what it is that we shout.

We wrote last June that in the conditions of the war, the struggle for national independence has been deserted by the colonial bourgeoisie, "by the people who led and directed it and then, at the showdown, brought it into the imperialist war camp," etc., etc.

Shachtman scarcely had gotten this off his chest when the pressure of the Indian masses impelled the bourgeois All-India Congress to embark on a civil disobedience campaign against Britain. Shachtman had said all such struggles are inevitably part of the imperialist war and undeserving of support. But great masses, ignoring his prophetic decree, arose under the formal leadership of the Congress. What would Shachtman say now?

Instead of admitting his error, as Morrow would do if he ever made one, Shachtman, it appears, was interested solely in saving face. But let Morrow speak for himself:

The new formula that Shachtman found is the "Workers Party Statement on India" (*Labor Action*, August 17). Its boldly-conceived principle is: "Stand by the people of India." What about *this present struggle led by the Congress*—does Shachtman support it? There is nothing about that in the statement. "The Workers Party stands 100 per cent with the people of India." But at the given moment the people of India are fighting under the banner of the Congress—does the "Workers Party" stand 100 per cent, or 10 per cent, behind *this* struggle? No, that is ruled out by Shachtman's June pronouncement, which he had to maintain in order, as they say in the Orient, to save face. That is worth more to Shachtman than ten revolutions....

The "Workers Party" statement is a deliberately dishonest document. It is designed to give the *appearance* of support without declaring support of the actual struggle led by the Congress.

And still further on:

Likewise for India, Shachtman will support nothing less than simultaneous insurrection on two fronts: against British imperialism and the native bourgeoisie. Naturally that would be best. But if the workers of India are not yet ready, if the native bourgeoisie stands, for the time being, at the head of the struggle against British imperialism? Shachtman will not support it, as he will not support the Soviet Union against Hitler, or China against Japan.

Nothing more than these few sentences are needed to reveal the essence of Morrow's political position, and how far removed it is from any understanding of what is going on in India, much less an understanding of Marxism.

What the Colonial Bourgeoisie Fights For

We say, literally, that "the struggle for national emancipation of the colonies has been deserted" by the colonial

bourgeoisie, that it is not fighting imperialism, that it is serving one imperialist war camp, or another, or, as in some cases, is in the process of shifting from one camp to another. We say, for the colonial bourgeoisie to fight for national emancipation now, more than ever before, means to let loose such class forces (workers and peasants) as would directly imperil its own social position, simply because in the conditions of the war a fight against imperialism (i.e., for national freedom) requires a struggle against both imperialist camps. *That* the bourgeoisie of the colonies is incapable of carrying on.

Morrow says, the Indian bourgeoisie launched a struggle against British imperialism, is carrying on such a struggle (or at least was doing so when Morrow wrote), and even "stands, for the time being, at the head of the struggle against British imperialism." Morrow says, the bourgeois All-India Congress is leading the "actual struggle," and it is this struggle and no other that must be supported, especially if you want to be saved from the tin thunderbolts of his theatrical wrath.

Morrow is not satisfied with our statement against British imperialism, for the full and unconditional national independence of India, and for the struggle—the strikes, the demonstrations, the so-called "riots," etc.—that the people are carrying on. No; that, you see, is just a lot of shouting on our part. And Morrow, if he is anything, is a doer. A statement of support of that struggle of the Indian people is not enough, says he. It seems there is something far more important, something that offers the decisive test of the revolutionist, especially of the *doing* revolutionist (i.e., Morrow). And the test? Simply this: Do you support the *actual* struggle? What, pray, is that? Why, nothing but the struggle led by the Congress, by the bourgeoisie! And what struggle is that? Why, nothing but the *actual* struggle!

In the admittedly vain hope that some day we may be transmogrified into a doer (e.g., like Morrow), and acting on the assumption that he can take off a minute from his ardent work of doing to enlighten us with some telling, we ask him: *Just what* does a person have to *do* in order to support "the actual struggle led by the Congress"? Do you have to call formally at Congress headquarters, ask politely if the bourgeoisie is in this morning, and leave a card or statement reading: "This is to certify that the undersigned recognizes and supports the actual struggle led by the bourgeoisie. (L. S.) Felix Morrow"? If not that, then what, oh Doer of Awe-Inspiring Deeds, do you do?

To the extent that Morrow's mumbo-jumbo has a political meaning—and it has one, that is clear—it is this: A prerequisite for participating in the struggle against British imperialism is to acknowledge the leadership of the Indian bourgeoisie! That is what he demands of us—otherwise all this mess of words about the mysterious "actual struggle" led by the bourgeoisie would be what it seems to be at first blush, but isn't—mere gibberish.

The whole point is that the actual events, which Morrow so elatedly describes as a refutation of our point of view, actually strengthen it. Bear in mind that we said the colonial bourgeoisie cannot now carry on "the struggle for national emancipation," that "only the leadership of the proletariat can re-launch the just wars of the colonies against imperialism." Morrow repeatedly, if unwittingly, proves that he is incapable of directing a revolutionary struggle against the treacherous colonial bourgeoisie because he is so greatly preoccupied with painting it in attractive colors instead of presenting it in its true light. That is what we mean by referring

to his ignorance of the Indian situation and of Marxism.

Where is the "struggle for national emancipation" that the Indian bourgeoisie launched when, as Morrow puts it, "Shachtman scarcely had gotten this off his chest"? Where is the struggle that the Indian bourgeoisie "stands, for the time being, at the head of"? Where is the "actual struggle led by the Congress"? It would be most enlightening to hear some details on these questions from Morrow.

He says that the masses, ignoring Shachtman, "arose under the *formal leadership* of the Congress." Do the words we italicized have a meaning, or are they there to fill up the line? If the leadership of the Congress was only *formal*, then it was not actual or real, and all that Morrow writes about it is so much wind through a funnel. But if there is some sort of "actual struggle led by the Congress," then the leadership is not formal but real. The fact is that Morrow's phrase, though obviously accidental and without significance to him, represents a most important truth: *The struggle launched by the Indian masses last fall was not led by the bourgeoisie; the bourgeoisie stabbed it in the back.* That is what Morrow does not understand; the poor fellow keeps talking about the "struggle against British imperialism" of the native Indian bourgeoisie and demands that everybody pay his respects to this leadership. But while that struggle may rage over the pages of the *Fourth International*, it was not to be found in India. Here is why:

With the rapid advances of Japan in the Pacific and on the Asiatic mainland, especially after the Burma campaign, the whole position of British imperialism in India was directly and immediately threatened. Threatened also, however, was the position of the Indian national bourgeoisie, the real bourgeoisie and not merely its petty bourgeois ideologists and parliamentarians. Gandhi, assuming he is really the political cretin he sometimes seems to be, declared that under his rule an independent India could be maintained even in the face of the Japanese threat by the simple device of telling the Japanese to desist. But apart from him, surely there is not, and was not then, a single serious capitalist or capitalist politician who actually thought in terms of an "independent India" ruled by them, without the presence of the British, and yet able to hold off the Japanese.

How They View Matters

Under the circumstances, there is no doubt—as we wrote at that time—that the bourgeoisie, or at least a section of it, was beginning to think in terms of transferring its allegiance from the imperialism which seemed to be on its way out (Britain) to the imperialism which seemed to be on its way in (Japan). This may sound like pure, and arbitrary, deduction, but we will nevertheless insist on it at least as a "working hypothesis," on the basis of our tested analysis of the colonial bourgeoisie, on the basis of the experience with that section of the Chinese bourgeoisie represented by Wang Chin Wei, on the basis of the experience with the former leader of the Indian Congress, Bose, who went over to the Axis some time ago.

Another section of the bourgeoisie, and above all of its political representatives, differed from the former not in thinking of national independence under native bourgeois rule—the Indian bourgeoisie rightly looks upon this as a Utopia under the actual conditions of the imperialist war in the Orient!—but in making a new arrangement with hard-pressed British (not Japanese) imperialism. The new ar-

angement had nothing to do with what the native bourgeoisie knows to be the unrealizable goal of *national independence*, unrealizable for it, that is, in the conditions of that "total and all-dominating war" whose character Morrow does not yet grasp. It had to do merely with a few more concessions to the native bourgeoisie, politically and militarily.

Did the bourgeoisie—again, we are speaking of the authentic native bourgeoisie, and not of petty bourgeois muddle-heads like Nehru who think they represent some independent social or political power—did the bourgeoisie even *want* national independence? Nonsense! That would mean, in the first place, the withdrawal of the British imperialist troops, the forces of occupation. It is the last thing in the world the Indian bourgeoisie wants right now, for it *knows* the realities of the "total and all-dominating" war in the East. It *knows* that the *military* forces capable of resisting *both* imperialist dangers can be mobilized and inspired only by *another class*, the proletariat. Even the section of the bourgeoisie that thinks in terms of a bargain with the Japanese would be averse to the British leaving right now, for that would deprive it of a strong bargaining point in any negotiations with the Japanese. That is why no responsible Indian bourgeois, and not even any serious Congress leader, made the categorical demand: Withdraw the military forces and military rule of Britain. Even Gandhi left himself an open door on this all-important and all-revealing point.

Alas for Morrow, he is so infernally busy with his doing (more exactly: with shouting about doing!), that all these simple facts pass by him and are nowhere reflected in his writings on India. He does not understand the significance of the little inter-imperialist war that is being fought in the East. He does not understand that under the conditions created by the war, the Indian bourgeoisie, precisely in order to maintain and improve its social and political position, *needs* British (or American!) imperialism. That's why he writes, with his eyes focused sharply on the seventh astral plane, that the "native bourgeoisie stands, for the time being, at the head of the struggle against British imperialism." He couldn't say it better if he were an editor of *The Nation* or the *New Republic*.

The State of the Mass Movement

Facts, please? There aren't any. The facts, at least so far as they are sent us through the dense screen of British censorship by the more or less intelligent bourgeois correspondents, indicate that the mass movement—that is, the strikes, demonstrations, "riots," the *actions* of the masses to which we are guilty of "confining" our support—is *leaderless*. The Congress leaders who were "impelled...to embark on a civil disobedience campaign," as Morrow so delicately puts it, made no evident arrangements to carry on a struggle—for the good reason that they had no intention of launching a mass movement of struggle. Again relying on what seems to be the most objective bourgeois reports from India, it appears fairly clear that once British democracy jailed the Congress leaders (to the relief of many of them, no doubt), the mass movement really broke out—but without leaders or directives or centralization! That's the distinguishing feature of the months-long struggle in India—and not the alleged "leadership of the bourgeoisie." To the extent that the movement had local and isolated leadership or direction, it was essentially *petty bourgeois*—students, intellectuals, middle class elements, trade union leaders, etc., etc.

And the bourgeoisie, which "stands at the head of the

struggle"—where was it in reality? Breaking strikes—that has been definitely reported by the *New York Times* correspondent! Running around from one imperialist circle to another in an effort to get a little something, a little concession from the adamant British, so that its hand could be strengthened in an open move to crush the mass movement, that is, to crush the "actual struggle" which they were "actually leading." If the British, who had meanwhile gained an important breathing spell in the struggle with the Japanese, did not find it necessary to grant a single concession, did not even feel it necessary to stall for time with another farce of a Cripps mission, it is because they know more about the real relationships between the Indian bourgeoisie and the struggle of the masses than Morrow does.

Why was the movement sapped and disorganized and disoriented and finally disintegrated? What happened to the "actual struggle," the one "the Indian bourgeoisie stands, for the time being, at the head of"? All reports seem to agree that for the present the scope of the movement has been greatly reduced and its effectiveness virtually broken. Did the bourgeoisie, which was "at the head of the struggle against British imperialism," call it off? When? And why? Morrow cannot possibly answer these questions. It was not "called off" by the bourgeoisie, because the bourgeoisie did not lead it, Morrow to the contrary notwithstanding.

What is true, and in a most important way, is that the movement, like the Indian masses in general, was under the ideological influence of the bourgeoisie, or more exactly, of the Congress. Having said this, the fatal, un-Marxian analysis and line of Morrow become more patent. Under such conditions, the task of the revolutionist is not to repeat with every liberal spinster that the struggle is "led by Congress" and that we must support this "actual struggle" and no other. Surely, a country that has produced one Louis Fischer has already over-subscribed its quota, and doesn't need another one in the person of Morrow. Surely, a movement that went through the experience of Stalinism with the Kuomintang doesn't need to go through it again, even if only in the form of political articles that reproduce, essentially, the Stalinist line in India today.

A good three-fifths of Morrow's attack on us can be found in the pages of the Stalinist press attacks on the Trotskyist China position in 1926-27: "petty bourgeois radicalism," "doers vs. shouters," the "actual struggle led by the Kuomintang," "abstentionism"—yes, a good three-fifths of Morrow can be found there. With this exception: the claim that the Chinese bourgeoisie stood at the head of a struggle against British imperialism some fifteen years ago was exactly one thousand times more warranted than Morrow's claim that the Indian bourgeoisie "stands, for the time being, at the head of the struggle against British imperialism." The Chinese bourgeoisie at least organized whole armies, millions of men, to fight the mercenaries of imperialism; the Indian bourgeoisie has yet to mobilize, arm, train and send into the field against the imperialists a single platoon.

For a Marxist Program—Against Opportunism

The task of the revolutionary Marxist is not to glorify the Indian bourgeoisie as the leader of an anti-imperialist struggle, but to expose its reactionary and treacherous rôle to the bone; not to cover it up the way Morrow does, but to show how it is begging to serve British and American imperialism in the war, only on somewhat more favorable terms for itself;

not to shout "support the struggle led by the bourgeoisie," but to say to the masses:

Watch them. Don't trust them an inch. They are not leading a fight against imperialism, but are dependent upon it and work hand in glove with it. Don't shout: "We are following the Congress!" but rather set about forming your own organizations, your own councils in town and village, completely independent of Congress and all other bourgeois parties and organizations. Threatened on one side by the British who hold you, and the Japanese who threaten to take you, you cannot and must not rely upon any other class to organize and lead the struggle for national freedom but the proletariat. Under the leadership of the princes or the bourgeoisie, you will only be impressed into the service of imperialism, to fight for the victory of one foreign exploiter over another. Only under proletarian leadership can you take the road to freedom.

This is the simple truth, and we are able to tell it. Our understanding of class relationships in the colonies, and of the character of the war, makes it possible for us to teach these ideas. They are the ideas that lead to the victory of the Third Camp over the two present imperialist camps. The Third Camp is the camp of the independent socialist proletariat and of the oppressed colonial peoples—the camp which Trotsky in the First World War called the Third Power.

The Cannonites cannot, it goes without saying, speak any longer in our terms. Under our influence and guidance, they did speak that way for the first few weeks following the outbreak of the war, but no longer. They have an utterly false conception of the war, not as an imperialist world war with its own sharp internal contradictions and unevennesses, but as being at least two different wars, each independent from the other. They have an utterly false, essentially Stalinist, conception (1926 vintage, not 1943, to be sure) of class relations in the colonies, a conception which has as little in common with Lenin's teachings during the First World War as it has with Trotsky's development of the basic theory of the permanent revolution.

Morrow quotes from the Workers Party statement on India in *Labor Action* of August 17, 1942. Much more to the point is a quotation from *The Militant* of the same time, August 22, 1942. It runs an editorial that is significantly headed: "1776 Showed the Way for India." It says:

Yet the people of India can find inspirations and weapons in their fight for freedom in America—not in the war Roosevelt carries on today but in the Revolutionary War for Independence (likewise from the British Empire), not in the Atlantic Charter, but in the Declaration of Independence.

This quotation, saturated with the spirit of Stalinist Kuomintangism, helps us understand a little better Morrow's insistence that we recognize the leadership of the bourgeoisie. The Indian Revolution faces, not its 1917, but its 1776, that is, the triumph and consolidation of national bourgeois power. And this reactionary tripe was written (by Morrow?) and printed in a *Trotskyist* paper. Engels once said upon reading Dühring: "If Hegel were not dead, he would hang himself." Upon reading Morrow and *The Militant*, all you have to do is replace Hegel's name with Trotsky's.

These conceptions lead the Cannonites, in the absence of a serious corrective and in the absence of Trotsky, to their social-patriotic position on China and to their glorification of the Indian bourgeoisie. Granted that it is organic with Morrow to give a semi-liberal, semi-Stalinist exaggeration to their policy. But the fact is that it is only an exaggeration of

what is already a false line and the fact is, furthermore, that Morrow writes with impunity. Aren't there people who know better? Of course, we know several in the SWP. But they have grown tired. Not all the tired radicals are outside the movement.

* * *

Once Again, the National Question

The social-patriotic position taken by the Cannonites on China in the war is catching up with them, so to speak, and in the strangest place—occupied Europe. It is worth discussing, if only because of the conflict between their obviously opportunistic position on the national (colonial) question in Asia and their apparently “radical” position on the national question in Europe.

Our own view on the latter question is adequately and roundedly presented in the resolution printed in the February issue of *The NEW INTERNATIONAL*. It is a question that the war's developments put forward with increasing persistency. Every day, almost, brings reports from the continent that show how vain is every attempt to escape taking a clear-cut position on the problems posed by the changes in the situation. Anyone with an ounce of political acumen plus an ounce of Marxian education knows that the national question—that is, the question of national independence, of the right of self-determination, of the struggle for national freedom—is now raised before us again in Europe, on a new and almost unprecedented scale, in a new period, and therefore in a new form.

Well over a year ago, our party first raised the question in the Marxian movement. We put forward a tentative, not fully developed, but nevertheless tendentious position. Independently, and at about the same time, the German Fourth Internationalists raised the question and began developing a viewpoint related, and in any case not hostile to our own. The same may be said, a little while later, of the French Fourth Internationalists. But every endeavor of the German and French comrades to interest the Cannonite leaders in the problem—to say nothing of their efforts to have the matter discussed—met with that suspicious and bellicose resistance that new ideas almost always meet from the small-minded provincial bureaucrat. How familiar we are with this phenomenon which, while not original with Cannon and his circle, is nonetheless indigenous to them. How well acquainted the French and Germans are with it now. One of the great advantages of living is the opportunities it affords you to learn.

Finally, *more than a year after* they submitted their views for discussion, and *after* the SWP arrived at a decision on the question (if you can call a couple of ridiculous paragraphs buried in a longer resolution a decision), the *Fourth International* prints a somewhat dated document by the German comrades. It is brief, highly condensed. We consider some of the formulations too loose, lending themselves to misinterpretation, especially when reviewed by a malicious or disloyal critic; other formulations are too summary and therefore inadequate. But *summa summarum*, as they say, the document showed that the German comrades were on the right track while the Cannonites were seated firmly in a stagnant pool.

The German document (“Three Theses”) is answered by the ubiquitous Morrow. What can be said, with all fairness, of Morrow's reply? It is disloyal, sly as a knife, pretentious. After the dirtiest possible innuendo and misrepresentation of the German position, he ends in a tone of mock earnest camaraderie: Perhaps we haven't fully understood you; we invite

you in all comradeship to make your position clear; kindly contribute a further explanation. So far as we know, the German comrades have not replied. It is deplorable, but not entirely surprising. After having been none too politely kicked around, abused and threatened for their independence of spirit, put under the gag, and then insulted by a reply from Morrow (not so much by the reply itself, mind you, but by the fact that Morrow was assigned to write it), there is little wonder that some of them end up disheartened and even demoralized. Answer at this date? and Morrow? . . .

The Appearance of New Polemicists

Not so disheartened is Marc Loris. He has finally been given signed and sealed permission to write, and he contributes a most intelligent, even if not fully rounded (the problem of Stalinism is wrongly treated, for example; the Chinese question is falsely presented) analysis of the national problem in Europe (*Fourth International*, September and November, 1942). It is of course a polemical presentation, though given the nature of the situation in which its author finds himself, the polemic is anonymous.

Wright's downright perversion of Lenin which we exposed several months ago—namely, Wright's declaration that there is a difference in principle between the national problem in the colonies and in Europe—is rejected out of hand by Loris. As for his other Cannonite colleagues, he speaks of them discerningly (though still anonymously!) in these terms: “formalists”; “absurd, pedantic and empty”; “incurable pedant” (the theory that Wright is incurable is, we think, debatable); “total lack of comprehension of imperialism”; “such mentality betrays a complete lack of understanding of our epoch” (not more, not less); “under a mask of radicalism, this argument betrays an inertia of thought inherited from liberalism” (this *could* be Morrow!); and more of the same. Restraint obviously contributes here to accuracy.

In the January, 1943, issue of the *Fourth International*, a much more serious personage than Morrow takes up the task of answering Loris' views, M. Morrison. Three solid pages of denuded and processed forest are covered with a wordy and terribly embarrassed effort to refute Loris. Morrow's polemics produce nausea; Morrison's, sympathetic tears. If you want a primer on how to say Yes, No and Maybe in systematic rotation, read the Morrison article (one might almost say: read *any* Morrison article).

The reader may say: Surely you are joking, or exaggerating. We reply: Not at all, for, following Loris' example, we are writing with restraint. Proof? Here it is—a representative sample of the prose, word for word, just as it is in the original Volapuk:

It goes without saying that under no circumstances should a revolutionary party ignore the natural and justifiable sentiments of the masses for national freedom. The masses must at all times see in socialism a champion of the right of self-determination of nations. That is true during the imperialist war as well as before or after it. It is not at all a question, as Loris puts it, of abandoning the demand for national freedom during the war.

It does not at all follow that, in order to be the champions of national freedom, we must under all circumstances use the slogan of national liberation. At the present moment, in the occupied countries we must concentrate on three things. We must refuse to support or participate in any way in the imperialist war; we must stand out as the champion of national freedom; we must emphasize the necessity of socialism as the solution to the problem confronting the European masses. Insofar as one slogan is capable of indicating these manifold tasks, the slogan of the Socialist United States of Europe best serves that purpose.

To any question whether we are for national independence, an un-

hesitating answer in the affirmative must be forthcoming [It would be refreshing, we must say, to hear Morrison give an unhesitating answer in the affirmative to any question—M. S.], with the explanation that in order to achieve it the masses must struggle for power to the workers.

Not bad, eh? "We must stand out as the champion of national freedom." "The masses must at all times see in socialism a champion of the right of self-determination of nations." How stand out as the champion of national liberation? How be seen as the champion. Simple! *By not adopting the slogan of national liberation!* It is subtle, it requires real figuring out—the kind Cannon would call dialectical—but it is unassailable: the way to get yourself looked on as a supporter of national liberation—what are we saying, "supporter"? We mean champion, yes, champion!—the way really to stand out as the champion of national liberation is . . . not to raise the slogan of national liberation. Not a diabolically clever way of achieving an aim, but a novel one.

But tell me, in all confidence of course, if you don't put forward the slogan of national liberation, how will you stand out as its champion? How will the masses see you as its champion, and "at all times," to boot?

Bah! That's the easiest thing in the world, like falling off a log! You want to know how we'll stand out, how the masses will see our position, our championship? Why, if they should care to ask us, we'll tell them! Unhesitatingly! What's to prevent the masses from finding out about our position under such circumstances? All they have to do is fill out a form letter with the right question, enclose a stamped return envelope, with ten cents in coin or stamps for research, handling and carrying charges, address it legibly to the right department of the party, and in less time than it takes to tell, they have our answer, "unhesitating . . . in the affirmative." No reasonable man could ask for more than that.

Morrison on a Merry-Go-Round

Just why shouldn't the Marxists raise and fight for the slogan of national liberation? Morrison is forced to give the real reason for Cannonite "abstentionism" on this point. He tries, first of all, to motivate his position theoretically and traditionally.

Whenever Marxists have advanced the slogan of national liberation it has been under circumstances where they were willing to support a struggle for independence even when it was under bourgeois leadership.

No sirree! Not always! There is, if you please, not an ounce of dialectical thinking in this statement. It does not correspond to the facts.

The program of the Fourth International puts forward the slogan of *national liberation for the Ukraine*. Did Morrison vote for that slogan under the impression that it meant supporting a struggle for Ukrainian independence "even when it was under bourgeois leadership"?

In the First World War, Lenin retained the slogan of national liberation for a series of countries (Serbia, Poland, etc.). Trotsky also "advanced the slogan of national liberation" for a number of countries in the First World War, Loris reminds us, by writing in 1916 that "the independence of the Belgians, Serbians, Poles, Armenians and others . . . belongs to the program of the fight of the international proletariat against imperialism. Yet neither Lenin nor Trotsky was "willing to support a struggle for independence, even when it was under bourgeois leadership" for the good, revolutionary-internationalist reason that these "bourgeois leaderships" were part and parcel of the imperialist war camps!

Along with the rest of the Cannonite leadership, Morrison simply has not grasped the Marxist, or, if you will, the Leninist, or, if you will, the Trotskyist, point of view on the national and colonial struggles in the period of inter-imperialist war. Morrison could not have put it more succinctly, or more crassly: If you are for national liberation, you will support its bourgeoisie in the struggle, come peace, come war, come hell or high water, morning, noon or night, year in and year out. The sentence quoted allows no other interpretation.

Yet Morrison cannot deny that the national question presses for an answer in Europe. He even wants to be, as we have seen, the champion of national liberation (a most peculiar kind of champion, but nevertheless a champion). But he will not raise the slogan of national liberation—like a terrified medicine man he refuses to mention the thrice-cursed Word. For a revealing reason:

Were we to adopt the slogan of national liberation for the occupied countries of Europe, consistency would demand that we pursue the same course in these countries as in China and India, that is, that we support the struggle for independence even if led by representatives of capitalism.

The Opportunism of the Cannonites

There we have it! There is the explanation for the conflict between the Cannonite position in China and in Europe. What "consistency would demand," the Cannonites are, fortunately, not prepared to give. The *consistent* application of their Chinese position to Europe would make transparently clear its essential *social-patriotism*. The fact that the Marxists, before the war, supported China against Japan, makes it possible for the Cannonites to continue supporting China *now* without the social-patriotic character of their position being immediately obvious, at least to most Cannonite followers. "Consistency would demand," however, that they now support Mikhailovich, King Haakon, de Gaulle and . . . Giraud, yes, Giraud! But that—how shall we put it?—that wouldn't look so good, would it?

Brought to the very brink of open social-patriotism by the logic of his China policy, Morrison pulls up short and tries to beat a retreat. That does credit to his revolutionary sentiment, but not to his policy or his logic. What happens to the demands of consistency? Simple: we refuse "to adopt the slogan of national liberation for the occupied countries." Which occupied countries? In the very ones, replies the self-same Morrison on the next page, where "we must stand out as the champion of national freedom."

Do you want a better example of how petty bureaucrats, trapped by the unfolding logic of a false policy but unwilling to acknowledge their mistake, will thrash about in a confusing frenzy and blacken the water all around them like a flailing octopus?

The Cannonites are writhing helplessly in the grip of a contradiction which their Chinese policy prevents them from solving. (Contrariwise, by the way, Loris, who supports the Cannonite policy in China, cannot possibly reconcile it with his more or less correct policy on the national question in Europe, and Morrison's taunts *on this score* are not out of place!) The contradiction can be resolved only on the basis of Marxist doctrine, which is confirmed by an objective analysis of the objective situation.

This does not signify, as some of our mechanical-minded critics seem to think, the abandonment of the struggle for national liberation in those countries, East or West, where it stands on the order of the day.

It does signify a recognition of the fact that *today* the leadership of the national bourgeoisie means that this struggle is

and cannot but be transformed into an integral part of the inter-imperialist war.

For the Program of the Workers Party

It signifies recognizing the fact that to support the struggle under present world circumstances, be it led by Mikhailovich, or de Gaulle, or Chiang Kai-shek, means to support one imperialist camp against another—and not the camp of national freedom against the camp of imperialism.

It signifies recognizing the fact that it is a *bourgeois lie and deception* when it is said that the war “led by Chiang Kai-shek is independent of the imperialist conflict” and that it is no less a lie and a deception when written over the signature of M. Morrison.

It signifies recognizing the fact that the proletariat, and above all the revolutionary Marxists, must really become the champions (and not Morrisonian champions, God save the mark!) of national liberation.

Finally and above all, it signifies recognizing the fact that the struggle for genuine national freedom, be it in China or Belgium, Servia or India, can be re-launched only under the

leadership of the proletariat, that is, under the leadership of the only class capable of *breaking with both imperialist war camps*.

The fight for national freedom cannot be conducted by the national bourgeoisie for the simple reason that it is incapable of breaking with imperialism, which means *today* that it is capable only of serving one imperialist camp or the other. The fight for national freedom cannot be conducted, either, by justifying and apologizing for the imperialist alliances made by the colonial bourgeoisie, which is the task assumed by Wright, Morrow and Morrison. The *prerequisite* for resuming the fight for national liberation—and resumed it must be, and under the openly unfurled banner of national liberation—is a *break with imperialism!* That is not only *the* road to national freedom for the oppressed countries, but *through* national freedom the road to *socialist freedom!*

Whoever does not teach and teach and teach these fundamental truths is not serving the cause of socialism or of national freedom, but will end by serving reaction in one way or another.

MAX SHACHTMAN.

Whither Zionism? Whither Jewry?—II

Discussion Notes on the Theology of Zionism

We shall briefly analyze Zionism in the light of the historical analysis of the Jewish problem hitherto indicated. Before explaining the historical origin of Zionism, let us classify it as a movement purely on the basis of its general theoretical premises. There are definite difficulties here, since in the Zionist movement not only are all classes in Jewry represented, but various ideologies which reflect, more or less clearly, their class positions as well. But since the World Zionist Organization is a bourgeois organization, certain general features, i.e., unalterable theoretical premises, dominate all shades of Zionist ideology.

The concept of Jewish nationhood is quite logically linked up to Zionism. Yet, debate as to the exactness and applicability of the term “nation” to the Jews is sheer idleness. A sociological definition only assumes political significance according to the interpretation of the function, importance, cohesiveness, etc., of the designated institution, association, custom, or whatever else has been assigned by the definition. For example, the class struggle was not discovered by Marx, but its all-pervasive influence, its significance in the interpretation of history, and the sharply drawn lines marking off one class from another are the interpretations that he attached to the concept of class. Therein lies the original contribution of his theory.

As part of Zionist theory, Jewish nationality implies a basically unassimilable nature of the Jews. Insofar as these arguments are toned down, they are expressed in the form of the undesirability of Jewish assimilation, which would mean a loss of Jewish contributions to mankind. These are nothing but inverted arguments of the anti-Semites. Where charges against the seclusiveness of the Jewish group are made, the ardent Zionist proudly raises his head in defiance, points out the “truth” of past charges by accusing Jewry of even trying to assimilate, unflinchingly emphasizes his uniqueness in history and in a spiteful tone answers: “Jews have always been unable

to assimilate. There is something distinctive in the Jew. We are proud of that. The greater the efforts to exterminate us physically or as a nation, the more dogmatically shall we reaffirm our faith in Jewish survival.” That this is nothing but inverted anti-Semitism is clearly borne out by the fact that Zionists (the American assimilationist Zionists excepted) frown upon non-Jewish influences on Jewish life, and, without exception, oppose all intermarriage between Jew and Gentile. Even the socialist Zionists would draw a line here. You ask: Why? Equality of mankind is all right as... an ideal, but... (this “but” always differentiates the revolutionist and the centrist) the others don’t want to. After all, there is still anti-Semitism, and really it’s... well... unethical. No, unethical. “Unesthetic” is indeed a fitting term.*

The *de facto* premises of Zionist philosophy are the unassimilability of the Jews and the idea of Jewish survival in the absolute sense. These premises, although by no means written into the political program of Zionism, are nevertheless everywhere an underlying factor. Among the bourgeois Zionists, the uniqueness of Jewish past, the progressive character of Jewish faith 2,000 years ago, etc., are stressed; the socialist Zionists are forced to resort to the theories of Otto Bauer on cultural autonomy, although it does not mean complete acceptance of Bauer’s interpretation of the Jewish question. It should be added that limited acceptance of cultural autonomy is not in contradiction to an acceptance of the theories of Ber Borochov (to be treated later) but serves to complement him in stressing the necessity of cultural survival. In fact, all socialist Zionists—with the exception of tiny sections of the small (and semi-Stalinist) Left Poale Zion—have rejected the purely

*Lest malicious readers deliberately misunderstand the above allusion: by opposition to mixed marriages the feelings of individuals who abhor such an act are not designated. What is meant is the opposition *on principle* as applying to all who are Jews by birth. This irrational opposition, which its advocates have applied to all, is closely reminiscent of Hitler’s concept of *Rassen-schande*.

political approach of Borochoy to the Jewish problem, substituting and diluting its only good points with the "liquidating" program of the Austro-Marxists.

For that reason let me recall briefly the criticism of such a program. It by no means leads to the road of revolutionary, anti-status quo nationalism. Whoever sees the main element of national oppression in suppression of local culture fails to understand the economic background of such suppression. Schools and language are to be assigned to each nation. Yet the achievement of such concessions, should it be possible without the revolutionary overthrow of the oppressing bourgeoisie, would by no means eliminate the causes of the suppression. The minority will still be economically exploited and new forms of "cultural" (sic) oppression will go with it. To really eliminate economic exploitation it is necessary to unite both the proletariat of the exploiter country and the exploited. It is here where cultural autonomy hinders this unity by creating new barriers. The medium toward the freeing of nationalities now works paradoxically against it.

In final comment on the "premises," let me mention that assimilation is not only possible but that it accompanied the Jewish community throughout the ages. Arthur Ruppin, leading contemporary Jewish sociologist, in his book *The Jews Today* (1909) gives detailed statistical material on the assimilation of the Jews. In his book *Jews and the Modern World* (1934) additional material is contained. The question of assimilation in circles which have taken the trouble to carry on serious research is simply not disputed. Assimilation stands as an uncontroverted fact in Jewish history. Should you fail to be convinced by Ruppin, look at the recent arrivals of Jews in this country from Germany, Austria, France, etc.

Thus, behind Zionism there lurks the unscientific racial theory (in veiled form, to be sure) supported by the completely false statement of non-assimilability.* On the political front we are faced with a purely reformist nationalism based on reformist precepts. Yet it is not sufficient to tear apart the lofty ideology behind Zionism; it is necessary to uncover the social forces that gave rise to such a movement and to evaluate and sift those factors that turn Zionism into a reformist, sometimes religious, sometimes chauvinist, movement. It should be remembered that Zionism is the outcome of a most convulsive progressive social struggle, of which past Jewish history has been so rich. Such an admission would be too much for some of their respectable associates. But it is of utmost importance to analyze the social milieu and motivation of modern Zionism.

Alongside the gradual oxidation of the beams that upheld the balance of the feudal structure which expresses itself in a series of violent outbursts, there occurred a parallel, perhaps somewhat more imperceptible, decomposition within the frail and morbid structure that held together Jewish life. What the French Revolution and the ensuing movement tried to achieve for the liberation of Europe, the Emancipation Movement among the Jews, as part of the former, aimed to attain for the Jews. They were sucked into the maelstrom of capitalism. The isolating process that had guided their history for the four or five preceding centuries was not only brought to an abrupt halt, but it was actually reversed.

*The Zionists as a rule regard anti-Semitism as a result of existing national and cultural disparities between the Jews and the traditional anti-Jewish bias of the non-Jewish world, which thus, according to the theory of racial anti-Semitism, consciously or unconsciously defends itself against alien influence. (Valentin: *Anti-Semitism—Historically and Critically Examined*, page 10.)

Capitalism served to give new life to the dormant forces of feudalism. Whatever could not be reawakened was unscrupulously destroyed.

The Jews' international connections, their past financial and commercial experience, their undiminished respect for learning the sciences, the arts, philosophy, etc., made them an element that, though not utilized to the fullest during the decline of feudalism, was of inestimable value to the full development of a capitalist economy. They supplied more than their normal share of philosophers, bankers, revolutionaries, scientists and writers. The Jews, as I outlined before, were ideally adapted to the growing needs of capitalism.

Individual and Group in Jewish Life

Yet there existed a peculiar paradox between the Jewish group and the Jewish individual. The Jews as a group still formed a segregated unit, segregated not only by the sinister powers of the Dark Ages, but also by following practices of worship that served merely to strengthen and perpetuate this distinction. This doubly reinforced segregation, influenced by environment and tradition, is what kept the Jewish group together and what explains the miracle of its survival. What contrast and bitter conflict between the group and the individual, between the general and the specific!

It is this observation that caused Marx to solve the dialectical conflict by the assertion that:

The Jew has emancipated himself in Jewish fashion, not only by taking to himself financial power, but by virtue of the fact that with and without his coöperation, money has become a world power, and the practical Jewish spirit has become the practical spirit of Christian nations. The Jews have emancipated themselves in so far as Christians have become Jews.

This leads him to a solution: "The social emancipation of the Jew is the emancipation of society from Judaism." The conflict is solved in the realm of general social emancipation, in revolutionizing practice that would make the practical, real every-day Jew impossible. Marx here very definitely means by Judaism the general psychology that motivates the real Jew in daily practice.

Upon closer examination it will be seen that Marx, as a Jew who had abandoned Judaism and who looked with a certain superiority upon those still embracing the Jewish faith, accurately pictured the bourgeois German Jew, though by no means did he proffer an all-inclusive picture of world Jewry.

It was in a similar vein that Kautsky in 1914 wrote:

The spiritual giants produced by modern Judaism could bring their forces into action only after they had burst the fetters of Judaism. . . . The Jews have become an eminently revolutionary factor, while Judaism is a reactionary factor. (*Are the Jews a Race?* Pages 245-246.)

In 1844, Marx still saw a close connection between the bourgeois revolution and the attainment of democracy. At the same time he recognized the incompleteness of bourgeois democracy and knew that full emancipation from "Judaism" could only be achieved in a form of society which eliminated the causes that create the modern everyday Jewish cult, "money and egoism." With Marx, it was a question of participation in the revolutionary struggle of the epoch. Judaism he saw as an obstacle, as an isolating factor. Hence he was viciously opposed to the continuation of a Jewish group.

Kautsky comes to the same conclusion, but in a very different manner. After probing into the scientific precepts of anti-Semitism, he comes to the conclusion that it is unwarranted and that there is no real good reason why the Jewish

group should continue to exist at all. The synthesis between the general emancipation of mankind and the emancipation of the Jew, which runs clearly through Marx's treatise, is completely absent from Kautsky, for the latter hoped for the gradual extension of democracy under capitalism, which would emancipate the Jew. Kautsky was nothing more than an ordinary assimilationist who believed that anti-Semitism could be refuted scientifically!

Moses Hess and the Jewish Problem

There was another prominent figure who tried to solve the complex of the Jewish individual and group. This was Moses Hess, a one-time collaborator of Karl Marx. In essence, when stripped of its philosophic cloak, his teaching amounts to the following: the Jewish culture is primarily historic and genetic; the Greek culture natural and "materialistic." During the Middle Ages Jews had a mission: to spread the genetic world view; today that mission is a fallacy. The Jews must seek regeneration through national survival, and after the solution of the "last nationality question" mankind will proceed to a synthesis between the two cults. Instead of realizing Jewish emancipation through the social emancipation of mankind, the emancipation of mankind is attained through the national regeneration of the Jews.

Hess to a certain extent understands dynamics, but he bases himself upon metaphysical concepts of race, nationality, etc. In letter 6 of *Rome and Jerusalem*, there is contained the profound statement: "Not the teaching, the race forms life." This enhances my previous statement that Zionism, similarly to anti-Semitism, is based on racial concepts. There are few Zionists familiar with Hess who do not ascribe to him a depth and completeness of understanding to be found in no other Zionist writer.

It is idle to refute Hess, but we shall show how he was a product of Jewish emancipation. Greatly perturbed by the anti-Jewish demonstrations and the blood accusations in the 1840's in Damascus, he combined defense of Jewish rights with national feeling. Yes, the survival of the Jewish nation is more important to him than the well-being of the individual Jew. Jews, according to Hess, cannot become workers, because to return on foreign soil means to break with Jewish faith. (*Ibid.*, Letter 12.) For Jews to participate in the general regeneration of mankind from the Middle Ages, the rigidity of their institutional structure had to be broken. Since Jews no longer constituted a separate economic category, it meant inviting assimilation. The only way to prevent this was to concentrate Jews on their own soil whence, as a unit, they could participate in the process of capitalist upbuilding. In other words, where Marx solved the group-individual paradox by revolutionary action, Hess solved it by quarantining the nation.

Nothing could stem the rising tide of assimilation; the outlook for capitalism was too rosy. Hess remained virtually forgotten for fifty years, while reform Judaism made headway.

* * *

It is a law that capitalism cannot and does not develop evenly. The law of the uneven development of capitalism is reflected in politics. In Russia, the bourgeoisie rather than venture forth on the basis of its own political program preferred to shield itself behind the feudal armor of the Czar. Capitalism here had become politically reactionary long before it had ever conquered political power. Similarly in Po-

land no such thing as a political revolution was ever attempted by the bourgeoisie. In the earlier national uprisings, the nobility had been the dominant class. Since the World War an alliance has been formed between the nobility and the bourgeoisie, the former being forced to participate to an ever-increasing extent in industry.

Before Jews ever set foot in Russia the clergy was already strongly entrenched there. In Poland they became linked with the feudal lords and became one of the pillars of their support. Hence, ever since the fifteenth century the Polish bourgeoisie has been the carrier of anti-Semitism. "Moreover, whereas in Western Europe the Jewish bourgeoisie constituted only a small percentage of the entire class . . . the Jewish townspeople in Poland were numerically stronger than the Christian inhabitants of the towns."* The upper bourgeoisie, because of the keenness of competition, the lateness of its arrival on the world market, the low absorptive capacity of the internal market as a result of the impoverishment of the peasantry, never was in a position to advocate liberation for the whole bourgeoisie. Sections of it had to be sacrificed so that the bourgeoisie as a class could realize sufficient profits for its own survival.

Russian policy after the start of the partition of Poland was to grant certain privileges to Jews as it did to other financial and commercial groups. With the growing protest of the native bourgeoisie, the Jews were finally herded into a restricted area known as the Pale. The concentration of the Jews, emphasized by the establishment of the Pale and their historical background had results not to be found in Western Europe: the existence of a sizable impoverished class of Jewish proletarians and totally impoverished artisans who had never known what political freedom meant. Equality, hence, was sought through the creation of a healthy Jewish nation, and such a theory became plausible because concentration had as its inevitable result a partial stemming of the tide of assimilation. It created certain definite cults and customs peculiar only to the Jewish community, and these tendencies were strengthened because of the recent successes of the general national movement. Whereas in Western Europe capitalism, along with the Emancipation Movement, sealed the fate of orthodox Judaism, in Eastern Europe the desire for emancipation could find expression only through the Jewish community.

Zionism first became a popular movement when the hopes that the Jews had pinned upon Czar Alexander II were ruthlessly shattered by his assassination and when waves of pogroms followed it. Shortly afterward the first wave of immigration to Palestine was under way. It is no coincidence that Zionism at that time received its great impetus when the hopes of an immediate political revolution in Russia were dimmed. Zionism had been acclaimed by individuals before, but only under the above conditions could it assume the expression of a mass movement.

* * *

We have to a certain extent indulged in a criticism of the theoretical (philosophical) premises of Zionist ideology. To present an outline summarizing the political aspects of Zionism is now in place. Zionist politics in the diaspora, Zionist politics in Palestine, and Zionism in world politics show that they are interlinked.

The practical political propaganda of Zionism in the

*Mahler—*Anti-Semitism in Poland, an Essay on Anti-Semitism*—1942. He quotes a Polish source showing that by the close of the eighteenth century the Jewish town population was 600,000 as compared with 500,000 non-Jews.

diaspora is based on two appeals: the suffering of Jews under the iron heel of Nazi-inspired persecution and the need to solve the Jewish problem in the specific country. Both are problems that have to be dealt with seriously in any Jewish political movement. To solve these problems, though, necessitates, the organization of the Jewish people into a mass movement with a transitional program based upon immediate needs. This would mean the politicalization of the Jewish masses, and this Zionism can never do.

The World Zionist Organization is a bourgeois organization despite the representation of delegates from the working class parties. Just as a bourgeois parliament does not become a coalition government of all classes because a delegate of a working class party is elected to it, so the character of the Zionist organization is not changed because it condescends to listen, every now and then, to a socialist delegate. Behind the *de jure* government there always lurks a *de facto* government. What motivates the coöperation of "all classes" within the WZO is the universal recognition that Palestine must be built up with the aid of private capital. The coöperation within the WZO is thus conditioned by the strength of private capital, a strength that is so powerful that it can noticeably advance or impede the colonization. The combined crisis of an overexpanded orange production and political clashes with the Arabs in 1936 caused a noticeable drop in the number of immigrants and a lowering of capital deposits in Palestine. Here the real nature of the WZO stood out in bold relief (we exclude for the moment the influence exercised at the foundation of the WZO by the House of Rothschild and Baron de Hirsch).

The ensuing policy of the National Funds was to help private capital get on its feet by making credits available to them on easy terms, by renting out land to private entrepreneurs. While the collectives waited for years for land on which to settle, enterprises with National Funds were started to procure cheap raw materials for private undertakings. The joint-purchase scheme has been in effect since 1939 and provides for purchases by the Hemnutah, Ltd. (Trust Co. of the KKL) with the joint funds of private capital and its own capital. This facilitates land purchase on the part of private interests at a time when conditions of purchase are favorable, and favorable conditions of purchase can always be attained by a large body such as JNF without the least guarantee that the tracts thus purchased will not be sold at higher prices when land prices rise. JNF thus practically puts the stamp of approval on speculation.

There is also provided, within a certain period, that the private partner of the joint-purchase scheme can turn over his land to the JNF at cost price. This seems to permit a method of safeguarding "national" capital against private capital; yet, on the contrary, JNF becomes more closely linked with private capital and the land in the hands of these private investors (obtained on favorable terms with the help of national capital) strengthens their bargaining power against JNF.

These instances can be multiplied many times. Furthermore, the policies of JNF are not merely a product of the crisis; what was once common practice has now been intensified. In a publication before the crisis, Granovsky, the land expert of the JNF, complains:

The... proclaimed principles of land policy (acquisition of land for the Jewish people as a whole—K. M.) have until now by no means been executed. Much more the contrary is the case, because since the inauguration of the Jewish colonizing work on a larger scale in Palestine much has happened and still happens, which stands in crass contrast to these principles. Although the Zionist Organization has in repeated resolutions

of its authoritative bodies recognized in principle the priority of national acquisition of land, there were for instance considerable funds diverted from the Zionist funds to private land purchasing companies, even in view of the danger that the interests of national land policy were impaired through it. To cite another instance: the Zionist banks grant credits to companies or individual landowners, without thereby posing any conditions which might guarantee the interests of national land policy. (Granovsky: *Land and Settlement in Palestine.*)

The Role of Philanthropy

As usual, it is through the financial channels that vested interests make their inroads. Yet, a significant portion of the capital comes from small contributors. But this latter fact does not change the situation one iota. Who owns the stocks in the modern corporation and who plays them on the stock market, manipulates their value, and conducts the general business of the corporation? Certainly not one and the same person. It is one of the distinct features of capitalist economy that it enables a few to gamble with the lives and possessions of the many. And think how much more profitable it is to risk other people's money in gambling for riches. Indeed, "he who risks nothing, wins all."

We shall prove the infiltration of vested interest by concrete instances and we shall mention names. For years now the door of Zionist funds have been left wide open for philanthropists. The Joint Distributing Committee, the United Jewish Appeal, into which the United Palestine Appeal was once temporarily merged, the similarity in personalities that sit on the directorates of the Jewish Congress and the Zionist Organization of America, all show the infiltration of philanthropic elements into Zionist politics.

It is not philanthropy as such that is obnoxious, but philanthropy can never be the basis for a political mass movement. In fact, it diverts attention from politics and dulls the political consciousness of the masses. Yet there is some philanthropy that is sincerely disinterested even though it can never transcend the bounds of our present class society.

Jewish philanthropy has made considerable profit on its investments. It is most obvious in the following Joint Survey Commission. A leading German Zionist is not afraid to point out that:

... the struggle of the Palestinian bourgeoisie and in Zionism against the influence of the workers on the reconstruction of the land becomes ever more violent. While writing these lines, the report of the Palestine Joint-Survey Commission (Control Commission for Palestine), whose chairman is Lord Melchet (the former Sir Alfred Mond) and of which the bankers, Felix Warburg, New York, and Wasserman, Berlin, are members, has been published. These representatives of Jewish bourgeoisie in America and Europe make their coöperation in the Jewish colonization work dependent upon the renunciation of all principles which have been carried into it by the working class. (Preuss: *Die Jüdische Arbeiterschaft in Palestina. Aufgabe und Werk.*)

Couple this with the inauguration of the settlement work by Rothschild and you shall have an unbroken chain of controlling Jewish financiers.

The Paléstinian proletariat, the only progressive force within Zionism, was already in 1929, deprived of its political voice in Zionist politics. It was in that year that the Jewish Agency was formed to administer Jewish politics, control immigration certificates and "a variety of other questions of an administrative or fiscal order." In this plot, political power, which had formerly been vested in the WZO, was shared with various representatives of philanthropic groups. Here the Jewish working class was always assured of defeat in advance. Capable of putting up at least a semblance of struggle in the WZO, it could never withstand the combined onslaught of the

philanthropists and bourgeois Zionists in an executive body of this character. After all, the coöperation of the capitalists was needed. Hence, the proletariat had to climb on the bandwagon and, as usual, the deal was justified on grounds of expediency.

The presence of Ben-Gurion, leader of Mapai (reformist labor party which in Palestine today is in revolt against its right wing leadership) no more influences the policy of this body than Bevin's presence in the British War Cabinet influences that body's colonial policy. On the contrary, being the Agency's mouthpiece he is often singled out for criticism, and rightfully so, since the Agency is the most outspokenly reactionary body in Zionist politics.

We shall now explain why the bourgeois leadership of the WZO cannot resort to the politicalization of the Jewish masses. The Jewish bourgeoisie in the diaspora is constantly fearing a wave of anti-Semitism. Here the supposed character of Zionist "nationalism" enters. The bourgeoisie, in the face of growing local anti-Semitism, seeks to divert the stream of immigration into harmless channels.* "Because of this, the four million American Jews have not only collected money for Palestine, but an additional \$15,000,000 for Russia, where the Soviet government in various sections has settled Jews in national groups as farmers and agricultural workers."** (Stechert: *Palestine Report of a Non-Jew*, page 150.)

Herzl, in addition, suggests Zionism as a cure for Jewish socialist intellectuals who are unable to find employment. This brings us to an important characteristic in Zionism, proletarian Zionism not excluded. Zionism feeds upon the disillusionment of the Jewish masses in emancipation and socialism. Herzl wanted to ship Jewish socialists away in order not to provoke criticism or revolution; he was afraid of socialism. Proletarian Zionists despair in the revolution. They often concede that revolution might solve some problems, but in the meantime, they declare, they have to look out for themselves. In its original form, it was expounded by Borochoff who also tried to put the nationalist movement on a class basis.

The Views of Borochoff

Theoretically, Borochoff falls flat. Proletarian Zionists use him, justify their Zionism through him, rather than follow the course he advocated. Yet he is easy to refute. He takes for granted the division of society into classes. But prior to the existence of classes, a national economic organism must exist. Hence the national struggle and common national interests exist prior to, and are more basic, than the division of society into classes. Then he clearly scrutinizes the various classes in relation to the territory and comes to the conclusion that there is no nationalism of a people but only the nationalism of classes. Thus Borochoff ends up in a contradiction. Classes can arise only after the existence of an economic organism, while nationalism, the struggle for the territory which provides its basis, can only occur on the basis of class interest in the territory.

The trouble with Borochoff is that he tries to go into tele-

*But on the basis of propaganda for European Jewry, American Zionism can never become a mass movement. As long as the bourgeoisie remains at the helm, its propaganda will not be directed with any considerable force on the Jewish problem in America.

**Yet by its very nature, by the force on which it relies (capital), by its perspective—Palestine as a solution to all specific Jewish problems under capitalism—by its leadership, the Zionist movement is a status quo movement. An anti-capitalist or revolutionary approach to the national problem can never be realized through the Zionist movement.

ology. Instead of treating the national movement in the same way as one is forced to treat rising classes, i.e., as existing and trying to explain what motivated them, he treats it as a categorical social phenomena whose very existence he must explain. In reality national movements were part of rising capitalist classes and the significance of the nation as an economic organism derives its significance from the capitalist organization of society. Nevertheless, there is much in his analysis that is valuable, and his conclusion remains valid, even though generalized and hence often distorted, that "only the proletariat can carry on a genuine national struggle." Yet, Borochoff himself is responsible for the distortion since he never broke with his left-Menshevik concepts.

Even though he perceives national interest as conditioned by a class viewpoint, his concept of nationhood and the relation between oppressor and oppressed nations is merely liberal. He tried to justify the slogan of self-determination on economic grounds. After the attainment of national demands the class struggle can commence, for "It is the purpose of these demands to assure the nation normal conditions of production and to assure the proletariat of a normal base for its labor and class struggle." (*Nationalism and the Class Struggle*.) Borochoff thus makes impossible international unity, since he considers the struggle against the foreign worker, who transcends the barriers set up by the bourgeoisie of one country in order to seek work, as progressive, and the native worker as only defending his "strategic base." He means, however, not the struggle to bring the wages of the two workers on a par but the struggle for national exclusion. (In a more practical discussion Borochoff rescinds this view, thus refuting, in practice, one of his theoretical premises.) Further, Borochoff knows nothing of the law of uneven and combined development. Like Martov, he sees the proletariat proceed from one task, solving it, and passing on to the next task. Hence he cannot conceive of social emancipation without first achieving national emancipation. But under capitalism such emancipation will never be achieved for a large number of countries. Thus, history would logically develop into a net of national struggles with the international proletariat never having the opportunity to solve the social question.

Borochoff, like Kautsky, believes in the growth of democracy in the universal application of self-determination for the world, and free immigration under capitalism. These myths are today destroyed. He thought that the dominant forces underlying Jewish immigration would lead the workers to Palestine. He failed to reckon with a modern imperialism that would slam the gates of Palestine in the face of refugees so as not to compromise its colonial interests. Nevertheless, he is about the only Zionist who ever tried to combine and integrate the daily needs of the Jewish worker with a program of Zionism.

It is interesting to note that Borochoff, in the latter period of his life, no longer relied upon the practical needs of the workers to explain his Zionism. Greater stress was put upon emotionalism in the Poale Zion, on the desire to see the Jewish nation rehabilitated as a nation. In other words, on irrational cultural grounds. The same trend can be noted in the modern Zionist movement. The illusion of a free and democratic capitalism ruthlessly destroyed by the advent of German fascism in Europe also awoke the Zionist movement. The futility of Zionism in a ruthlessly unfriendly social order is gradually being realized.

A leaflet of the French Zionist underground movement shows, despite its democratic-Stalinist orientation, the follow-

ing trend. It urges class solidarity with the oppressed French workers against the Nazi oppressor. National and social emancipation are here linked together. Despite vagueness, it is clear from the text that national liberation is conceived of only in a new world order. Whether that new world order is represented by Soviet Russia, the democracies or socialism is not clearly indicated. For precisely that reason it is probably a type of liberalism represented by the left wing liberals and by the Stalinists. I have had similar oral information regarding the Polish Zionists.

What is significant here is not the revolutionary socialist content in the leaflet, but the recognition that the realization of Zionism is dependent not upon the self-sacrifice, or "sty-chic" processes, or philanthropic enterprises of Jewry, but upon the international situation. Hence in the future, the division among Zionists will more and more take on the same features that mark class divisions all over the world because it will be the world social order upon which the realization of Zionism will depend. The realization of Zionism will also mean liberation from Britain, for remember, by Poale Zionism, under "political and territorial autonomy," Borochov meant independence from the "step-mother" country.

In America the recognition of the growing interdependence between a revival of the stagnant world order and Zionism is cleverly diverted into clamor for a Jewish army. How

Jews fighting in separate units rather than as part of the British army will aid European Jewry is beyond us. Yet it is based on the bourgeois Zionist concept of bargaining. A Jewish army, the Weitzman hope, will, after the war, increase the moral claim of the Jews to Palestine. The futility of such a program is to be found in the noticeable lack of success in the last war and, thus far, in this war. The American dean of the University of Cairo not long ago explained the reasons behind the refusal of a Jewish army. It is deemed undesirable in view of Arab sentiments. Instead of unity with the Arabs, Zionism will gladly remain tools of the British policy of *divide et impera* policy. There are many other aspects to this program, but to analyze them all is beyond the scope of this little essay.

We have already summarized Marx, Kautsky and Bauer, and the Marxian Zionist, Borochov, on the Jewish problem. (In the way of a general analysis of the history of the Jewish problem, the approach of this essay owes a great deal to Borochov.) Lenin contributed little that was original in this field; he relied on Kautsky. The large Jewish Socialist Party, the Bund, is, in ideology, based on the theories of Otto Bauer, which have already been criticized.

KARL MINTER.

[Concluded in next issue]

ARCHIVES OF THE REVOLUTION Documents Relating to the History and Doctrine of Revolutionary Marxism

What Does Spartacus Want?

[Concluded from Last Issue]

III—Lessons of the November Revolution

It was typical of the first period of the revolution down to December 24 that the revolution remained exclusively political. Hence the infantile character, the inadequacy, the half-heartedness, the aimlessness, of this revolution. Such was the first stage of a revolutionary transformation whose main objective lies in the economic field, whose main purpose it is to secure a fundamental change in economic conditions. Its steps were as uncertain as those of a child groping its way without knowing whither it is going; for at this stage, I repeat, the revolution had a purely political stamp. But within the last two or three weeks a number of strikes have broken out quite spontaneously. Now, I regard it as the very essence of this revolution that strikes will become more and more extensive, until they constitute at last the focus of the revolution. [Applause.] Thus we shall have an economic revolution, and therewith a socialist revolution. The struggle for socialism has to be fought out by the masses, by the masses alone, breast to breast against capitalism; it has to be fought out by those in every occupation, by every proletarian against his employer. Thus only can it be a socialist revolution.

The thoughtless had a very different picture of the course of affairs. They imagined it would merely be necessary to overthrow the old government, to set up a socialist government at the head of affairs, and then to inaugurate socialism

by decree. Another illusion? Socialism will not be and cannot be inaugurated by decrees; it cannot be established by any government, however admirably socialistic. Socialism must be created by the masses, must be made by every proletarian. Where the chains of capitalism are forged, there must the chains be broken. That only is socialism, and thus only can socialism be brought into being.

The Strike in the Revolution

What is the external form of struggle for socialism? The strike, and that is why the economic phase of development has come to the front in the second act of the revolution. This is something on which we may pride ourselves, for no one will dispute with us the honor. We of the Spartacus Group, we of the Communist Party of Germany, are the only ones in all Germany who are on the side of the striking and fighting workers. [Hear! Hear] You have read and witnessed again and again the attitude of the Independent Socialists toward strikes. There was no difference between the outlook of *Vorwärts* and the outlook of *Freiheit*. Both journals sang the same tune: Be diligent, socialism means hard work. Such was their utterance while capitalism was still in control! Socialism cannot be established thus-wise, but only by carrying on an unremitting struggle against capitalism. Yet we see the claims of the capitalists defended, not only by the most outrageous profit-snatchers, but also by the Independent Socialists and by their organ, *Freiheit*; we find that our Communist Party stands alone in supporting the workers against the exactions of capital. This suffices to show that all are today per-

sistent and unsparing enemies of the strike, except only those who have taken their stand with us upon the platform of revolutionary communism.

The conclusion to be drawn is not only that during the second act of the revolution strikes will become increasingly prevalent; but, further, that strikes will become the central feature and the decisive factors of the revolution, thrusting purely political questions into the background. The inevitable consequence of this will be that the struggle in the economic field will be enormously intensified. The revolution will therewith assume aspects that will be no joke to the bourgeoisie. The members of the capitalist class are quite agreeable to mystifications in the political domain, where masquerades are still possible, where such creatures as Ebert and Scheidemann can pose of socialists; but they are horror-stricken directly profits are touched. To the Ebert-Scheidemann government, therefore, the capitalists will present these alternatives. Either, they will say, you must put an end to strikes, you must stop this strike movement which threatens to destroy us; or else, we have no more use for you. I believe, indeed, that the government has already damned itself pretty thoroughly by its political measures. Ebert and Scheidemann are distressed to find that the bourgeoisie no longer reposes confidence in them. The capitalists will think twice before they decide to cloak in ermine the rough upstart, Ebert. If matters go so far that a monarch is needed, they will say: "It does not suffice a king to have blood upon his hand; he must also have blue blood in his veins." [*Hear! Hear!*] Should matters reach this pass, they will say: "If we needs must have a king, we will not have a parvenu who does not know how to comport himself in kingly fashion." [*Laughter.*]

Thus Ebert and Scheidemann are coming to the point when a counter-revolutionary movement will display itself. They will be unable to quench the fires of the economic class struggle, and at the same time with their best endeavors they will fail to satisfy the bourgeoisie. There will be a desperate attempt at counter-revolution, perhaps an unqualified militarist dictatorship under Hindenburg, or perhaps the counter-revolution will manifest itself in some other form; but in any case, our heroes will take to the woods. [*Laughter.*]

It is impossible to speak positively as to details. But we are not concerned with matters of detail, with the question precisely what will happen, or precisely when it will happen. Enough that we know the broad lines of coming developments. Enough that we know that, to the first act of the revolution, to the phase in which the political struggle has been the leading figure, there will succeed a phase predominantly characterized by an intensification of the economic struggle, and that sooner or later the government of Ebert and Scheidemann will take its place among the shades.

Spartacus and the National Assembly

It is far from easy to say what will happen to the National Assembly during the second act of the revolution. Perchance, should the assembly come into existence, it may prove a new school of education for the working class. But it seems just as likely that the National Assembly will never come into existence. Let me say parenthetically, to help you to understand the grounds upon which we were defending our position yesterday, that our only objection was to limiting our tactics to a single alternative. I will not reopen the whole discussion, but will merely say a word or two lest any of you should falsely imagine that I am blowing hot and cold with the same

breath. Our position today is precisely that of yesterday. We do not propose to base our tactics in relation to the National Assembly upon what is a possibility but not a certainty. We refuse to stake everything upon the belief that the National Assembly will never come into existence. *We wish to be prepared for all possibilities, including the possibility of utilizing the National Assembly for revolutionary purposes should the assembly ever come into being.* Whether it comes into being or not is a matter of indifference, for whatever happens the success of the revolution is assured.

What fragments will then remain of the Ebert-Scheidemann government or of any other alleged social-democratic government which may happen to be in charge when the revolution takes place? I have said that the masses of the workers are already alienated from them, and that the soldiers are no longer to be counted upon as counter-revolutionary cannon-fodder. What on earth will the poor pygmies be able to do? How can they hope to save the situation? They will still have one last chance. Those of you who have read today's newspapers will have seen where the ultimate reserves are, will have learned whom it is that the German counter-revolution proposes to lead against us should the worst come to the worst. You will all have read how the German troops in Riga are already marching shoulder to shoulder with the English against the Russian Bolsheviks. Comrades, I have documents in my hands which throw an interesting light upon what is now going on in Riga. The whole thing comes from the headquarters staff of the Eighth Army, which is collaborating with Herr August Winnig, the German social-democrat and trade union leader. We have always been told that the unfortunate Ebert and Scheidemann are victims of the Allies. But for weeks past, since the very beginning of our revolution, it has been the policy of *Vorwärts* to suggest that the suppression of the Russian Revolution is the earnest desire of the Allies. We have here documentary evidence how all this was arranged to the detriment of the Russian proletariat and of the German revolution. In a telegram dated December 26th, Lieutenant-Colonel Bürkner, chief of general staff of the Eighth Army, conveys information concerning the negotiations which led to this agreement at Riga. The telegram runs as follows:

"On December 23 there was a conversation between the German plenipotentiary Winnig, and the British plenipotentiary Monsanquet, formerly consul-general at Riga. The interview took place on board HMS *Princess Margaret* and the commanding officer of the German troops was invited to be present. I was appointed to represent the army command. The purpose of the conversation was to assist in the carrying out of the armistice conditions. The conversation took the following course:

"From the English side: The British ships at Riga will supervise the carrying out of the armistice conditions. Upon these conditions are based the following demands:

"(1) The Germans are to maintain a sufficient force in this region to hold the Bolsheviks in check and to prevent them from extending the area now occupied.

"(3) A statement of the present disposition of the troops fighting the Bolsheviks, including both the German and the Lettish soldiers, shall be sent to the British staff officer, so that the information may be available for the senior naval officer. All future dispositions of the troops carrying on the fight against the Bolsheviks must in like manner be communicated through the same officer.

“(4) A sufficient fighting force must be kept under arms at the following points; in order to prevent their being seized by the Bolsheviks, and in order to prevent the Bolsheviks from passing beyond a line connecting the places named: Walk, Wolmar, Wenden, Friedrichstadt, Pensk, Mitau.

“(5) The railway from Riga to Libau must be safeguarded against Bolshevik attack, and all British supplies and communications passing along this line shall receive preferential treatment.”

A number of additional demands follows.

Let us now turn to the answer of Herr Winnig, German plenipotentiary and trade union leader:

“Though it is unusual that a desire should be expressed to compel a government to retain occupation of a foreign state, in this case it would be our own wish to do so, since the question is one of protecting German blood. [The Baltic Barons!] Moreover, we regard it as a moral duty to assist the country which we have liberated from its former state of dependence. Our endeavors would, however, be likely to be frustrated, in the first place, by the condition of the troops, for our soldiers in this region are mostly men of considerable age and comparatively unfit for service and, owing to the armistice, keen on returning home and possessed of little will to fight; in the second place, owing to the attitude of the Baltic governments, by which the Germans are regarded as oppressors. But we will endeavor to provide volunteer troops, consisting of men with a fighting spirit, and indeed this has already in part been done.”

Here we see the counter-revolution at work. You will have read not long ago of the formation of the Iron Division expressly intended to fight the Bolsheviks in the Baltic provinces. At that time there was some doubt as to the attitude of the Ebert-Scheidemann government. You will now realize that the initiative in the creation of such a force actually came from the government.

One word more concerning Winnig. It is no chance matter that a trade union leader should perform such political services. We can say, without hesitation, that the German trade union leaders and the German social-democrats are the most infamous scoundrels the world has ever known. [*Vociferous applause.*] Do you know where these fellows, Winnig, Ebert and Scheidemann ought by right to be? By the German penal code, which they tell us is still in force, and which continues to be the basis of their own legal system, they ought to be in jail! [*Vociferous applause.*] For by the German penal code it is an offense punishable by imprisonment to enlist German soldiers for foreign service. Today there stand at the head of the “socialist” government of Germany men who are not merely the Judases of the socialist government and traitors to the proletarian revolution, but who are jailbirds, unfit to mix with decent society. [*Loud applause.*]

IV—Tactics of the German Revolution

To resume the thread of my discourse, it is clear that all these machinations, the formation of Iron Divisions and, above all, the before-mentioned agreement with British imperialists, must be regarded as the ultimate reserves, to be called up in case of need in order to throttle the German socialist movement. Moreover, the cardinal question, the question of the prospects of peace, is intimately associated with the affair. What can such negotiations lead to but a fresh lighting-up of the war? While these rascals are playing a comedy in Germany, trying to make us believe that they are working overtime in order to arrange conditions of peace, and declar-

ing that we Spartacists are the disturbers of the peace whose doings are making the Allies uneasy and retarding the peace settlement, they are themselves kindling the war afresh, a war in the East to which a war on German soil will soon succeed. Once more we meet with a situation the sequel of which cannot fail to be a period of fierce contention. It develops upon us to defend, not socialism alone, not revolution alone, but likewise the interests of world peace. Herein we find a justification for the tactics which we of the Spartacus Group have consistently and at every opportunity pursued throughout the four years of the war. Peace means the world-wide revolution of the proletariat. In one way only can peace be established and peace be safeguarded—by the victory of the socialist proletariat! [*Prolonged applause.*]

What general tactical considerations must we deduce from this? How can we best deal with the situation with which we are likely to be confronted in the immediate future? Your first conclusion will doubtless be a hope that the fall of the Ebert-Scheidemann government is at hand, and that its place will be taken by a declared socialist proletarian revolutionary government. For my part, I would ask you to direct your attention, not to the apex, but to the base. We must not again fall into the illusion of the first phase of the revolution, that of December 9; we must not think that when we wish to bring about a socialist revolution it will suffice to overthrow the capitalist government and to set up another in its place. There is only one way of achieving the victory of the proletarian revolution. We must begin by undermining the Ebert-Scheidemann government, by destroying its foundations through a revolutionary mass struggle on the part of the proletariat. Moreover, let me remind you of some of the inadequacies of the German revolution, inadequacies which have not been overcome with the close of the first act of the revolution. We are far from having reached a point when the overthrow of the government can ensure the victory of socialism. I have endeavored to show you that the revolution of November 9 was, before all, a political revolution; whereas the revolution which is to fulfill our aims, must, in addition, and mainly, be an economic revolution. But further, the revolutionary movement was confined to the towns, and even up to the present date the rural districts remain practically untouched. Socialism would prove illusory if it were to leave our present agricultural system unchanged. From the broad outlook of socialist economics, manufacturing industry cannot be remodelled unless it be quickened through a socialist transformation of agriculture. The leading idea of the economic transformation that will realize socialism is an abolition of the contrast and the division between town and country. This separation, this conflict, this contradiction, is a purely capitalistic phenomenon, and it must disappear as soon as we place ourselves upon the socialist standpoint. If socialist reconstruction is to be undertaken in real earnest, we must direct attention just as much to the open country as to the industrial centers, and yet as regards the former we have not even taken the first steps. This is essential, not merely because we cannot bring about socialism without socializing agriculture; but also because, while we may think we have reckoned to the last reserves of the counter-revolution against us and our endeavors, there remains another important reserve which has not yet been taken into account. I refer to the peasantry. Precisely because the peasants are still untouched by socialism, they constitute an additional reserve for the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. The first thing our enemies will do when the flames of the socialist strikes begin to scorch their heels will

be to mobilize the peasants, who are fanatical devotees of private property. There is only one way of making headway against this threatening counter-revolutionary power. We must carry the class struggle into the country districts; we must mobilize the landless proletariat and the poorer peasants against the richer peasants. [*Loud applause.*]

For Workers' Councils

From this consideration we must deduce what we have to do to insure the success of the revolution. First and foremost, we have to extend in all directions the system of workers' councils. What we have taken over from November 9 are mere weak beginnings, and we have not wholly taken over even these. During the first phase of the revolution we actually lost extensive forces that were acquired at the very outset. You are aware that the counter-revolution has been engaged in the systematic destruction of the system of workers' and soldiers' councils. In Hesse, these councils have been definitely abolished by the counter-revolutionary government; elsewhere, power has been wrenched from their hands. Not merely, then, have we to develop the system of workers' and soldiers' councils, but we have to induce the agricultural laborers and the poorer peasants to adopt this system. We have to seize power, and the problem of the seizure of power assumes this aspect; what, throughout Germany, can each workers' and soldiers' council achieve? [*Bravo!*] There lies the source of power. We must mine the bourgeois state and we must do so by putting an end everywhere to the cleavage in public powers, to the cleavage between legislative and executive powers. These powers must be united in the hands of the workers' and soldiers' councils.

Comrades, we have here an extensive field to till. We must build from below upward, until the workers' and soldiers' councils gather so much strength that the overthrow of the Ebert-Scheidemann or any similar government will be merely the final act in the drama. For us the conquest of power will not be effected at one blow. It will be a progressive act, for we shall progressively occupy all the positions of the capitalist state, defending tooth and nail each one that we seize. Moreover, in my view and in that of my most intimate associates in the party, the economic struggle, likewise, will be carried on by the workers' councils. The settlement of economic affairs, and the continued expansion of the area of this settlement, must be in the hands of the workers' councils. The councils must have all power in the state. To these ends must we direct our activities in the immediate future, and it is obvious that, if we pursue this line, there cannot fail to be an enormous and immediate intensification of the struggle. For step by step, by hand-to-hand fighting, in every province, in every town, in every village, in every commune, all the powers of the state have to be transferred bit by bit from the bourgeoisie to the workers' and soldiers' councils. But before these steps can be taken, the members of our own party and the proletarians in general must be schooled and disciplined. Even where workers' and soldiers' councils already exist, these councils are as yet far from understanding the purposes for which they exist. [*Hear! hear!*] We must make the masses realize that the workers' and soldiers' council has to be the central feature of the machinery of state, that it must concentrate all power within itself, and must utilize all powers for the one great purpose of bringing about the socialist revolution. Those workers who are already organized to form workers' and soldiers' councils are still very far from having adopted such an outlook, and only isolated proletarian minorities are

as yet clear as to the tasks that devolve upon them. But there is no reason to complain of this, for it is a normal state of affairs. The masses must learn how to use power, by using power. There is no other way. We have, happily, advanced since the days when it was proposed to "educate" the proletariat socialistically. Marxists of Kautsky's school are, it would seem, still living in those vanished days. To educate the proletarian masses socialistically meant to deliver lectures to them, to circulate leaflets and pamphlets among them. But it is not by such means that the proletarians will be schooled. The workers, today, will learn in the school of action. [*Hear! hear!*]

* * *

Our Scripture reads: In the beginning was the dead. Action for us means that the workers' and soldiers' councils must realize their mission and must learn how to become the sole public authorities throughout the realm. Thus only can we mine the ground so effectively as to make everything ready for the revolution which will crown our work. Quite deliberately, and with a clear sense of the significance of our words, did some of us say to you yesterday, did I in particular say to you: "Do not imagine that you are going to have an easy time in the future!" Some of the comrades have falsely imagined me to assume that we can boycott the National Assembly and then simply fold our arms. It is impossible, in the time that remains, to discuss this matter fully, but let me say that I never dreamed of anything of the kind. My meaning was that history is not going to make our revolution an easy matter like the bourgeois revolutions. In those revolutions it sufficed to overthrow the official power at the center and to replace a dozen or so of persons in authority. But we have to work from beneath. Therein is displayed the mass character of our revolution, one which aims at transforming the whole structure of society. It is thus characteristic of the modern proletarian revolution, that we must effect the conquest of political power, not from above, but from beneath. The Ninth of November was an attempt, a weakly, half-hearted, half-conscious and chaotic attempt, to overthrow the existing public authority and to put an end to ownership rule. What is now incumbent upon us is that we should deliberately concentrate all the forces of the proletariat for an attack upon the very foundations of capitalist society. There, at the root, where the individual employer confronts his wage slaves; at the root, where all the executive organs of ownership rule confront the objects of this rule, confront the masses; there, step by step, we must seize the means of power from the rulers, must take them into our own hands. Working by such methods, it may seem that the process will be a rather more tedious one than we had imagined in our first enthusiasm. It is well, I think, that we should be perfectly clear as to all the difficulties and complications in the way of revolution. For I hope that, as in my own case, so in yours also, the augmenting tasks we have to undertake will neither abate zeal nor paralyze energy. Far from it, the greater the task, the more fervently will you gather up your forces. Nor must we forget that the revolution is able to do its work with extraordinary speed. I shall make no attempt to foretell how much time will be required. Who among us cares about the time, so long only as our lives suffice to bring it to pass? Enough for us to know clearly the work we have to do; and to the best of my ability I have endeavored to sketch, in broad outline, the work that lies before us. [*Tumultuous applause.*]

ROSA LUXEMBURG.

Berlin, December 30, 1918.

A New Literary Critic

ON NATIVE GROUNDS, by Alfred Kazin.
Reynal & Hitchcock, Publishers; \$3.75.

Whoever is at all interested in the development of American intellectual life during the past half century—and more particularly, its prose literary sector—should read Alfred Kazin's book. It is a serious, full-dress work, not a haphazard collection of essays. It is written with an enthusiasm and sympathy for the American writer and his work which is rare in contemporary American criticism, and at the same time it is critical rather than rapturous.

While Kazin's basic thesis, the alienation of the American writer from his native social grounds and his struggle for reintegration, is stated in the preface and returned to in the last chapter, it is not a very powerful discipline binding the individual essays into a tight chain. While his thesis asserts itself to advantage in the brilliant essay on Dos Passos, it is perhaps to the good that it is neglected elsewhere. Kazin is not a critic strictly bound by a "school" or drawing strength from a homogeneous discipline; his major virtue is a youthful freshness and vivacity. He has perceived with some shrewdness, though without much originality, one of the primary molding influences on American literature: the inability of the writer, be he revolutionary or recluse, reactionary Southern agrarian or expatriate aesthete, to find roots for his life and work in a feeling of "belonging" to a rich tradition and vital community. Even those who at present have become the most hysterical or mystical defenders of the status quo (Macleish et al.) prove the validity of this thesis by barrenness of their output.

Interwoven with this thesis are a number of secondary ones. Kazin has borrowed from Parrington, even though he is niggardly in admitting it. The struggle against the genteel tradition, the revolt against the small town, the conflict between Jeffersonian equalitarianism and Hamiltonian aristocracy which had such a decisive influence on American life long after the original issues and persons involved were dead and which survives to this very day in our national life—these themes of Parrington creep through Kazin's book.

But the reader will find a lot more than thesis in *On Native Grounds*. The richest yield is a number of individual essays, some of them extraordinarily brilliant, such as the pieces on Upton Sinclair, Jack London, Dos Passos and Ellen Glasgow. Kazin does not have the ability to penetrate ruthlessly the intellectual marrow of a writer's thought nor is he especially competent at abstruse technical and stylistic analysis; his forte is his readiness to approach each writer as a distinct and unique creator, to visualize his problems, to establish a link of understanding between the strivings of the author and the reception of the reader.

A CRITICISM OF TWO SCHOOLS

Brief mention must also be made of the chapter, "Criticism at the Poles." This is a savage and annihilating attack on the Stalinist "literary criticism" on the one hand, and an almost equally savage attack against the Tate-Ransom-Blackmur school which place an absolute premium on form. One involuntarily blushes at the memory of having in any way been connected with or sympathetic to the drivel which the

Hicks-Schneider-New Masses school peddled during the "proletarian literature" days and it is little wonder that the Stalinists printed a vicious and stupid attack on Kazin in their magazine.

These are a few of the high points of the book. From the very sources of Kazin's accomplishments, however, come also his shortcomings. For one thing, there is often a disturbing eclecticism of approach which is most obvious in his chapter on criticism. It is true enough that Schneider and Tate, for instance, represent two untenable extremes, but it is not sufficient to wish a plague on both their houses. Tate, at the very least, is a talented critic and his group has done much to reawaken respect for economy, discipline and technical competence during the age of gushers; Schneider, on the other hand, is not a literary critic, but a paid hack who slants his reviews in accordance with the Kremlin line. While the alternative would be a false one, we for our part would choose Tate in the field of literature any day in the week if he were the sole alternative to Schneider-Hicks; and Kazin, in his eclectic anxiety to chip away at all tendencies, fails to weigh properly their real significance.

Kazin's shortcomings find their source in his abilities in still another respect. He has such a talent for the phrase, such a fertility of language and felicity of epigram that he often cannot restrain himself from making a quip at the expense of his theme. Many of his essays would profit from a friendly blue pencil. Sometimes he even loses the thread of his idea because of his fascination with the play of his language; there are one or two essays in which the musical rise and fall of the paragraph line is more obvious than the development of the idea.

THE BOOK'S SHORTCOMINGS

But the most serious objection on *On Native Grounds* is the attempt made in the final chapter to inject a note of strained optimism about contemporary American literature (how unwarranted when one examines what is being written today!) based on a sort of New Dealish nationalism. It is not the strident, mystical nationalism of Brooks and Waldo Frank but a more rational, liberalistic nationalism. Nonetheless, it has no organic tie to the thesis which Kazin begins with, and if Kazin desires to suggest that it is by an attempt at identification with the liberalist-nationalism of the New Deal-directed imperialist war that the writer can solve those deep, knotted problems which are the inheritance of a cultural tradition twisted by a morbidly sick society, then he is making a sorry mistake indeed, and what is more, he knows better.

Kazin is still a very young man. He possesses great talents, and while this book is by no means a completely successful work, it has enough and promises enough for the future to claim the interested reader's attention.

R. F.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Requires the AUGUST and OCTOBER, 1942, issues of the magazine for binding purposes. We will appreciate it if our friends and readers send these copies to

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

114 West 14th Street

New York, N. Y.

Princely Potpourri

ON BORROWED PEACE, by Prince Hubertus zu Loewenstein, Published by Doubleday, Doran & Co., Inc.; an American Mercury Book; 344 pages, \$3.00.

Here is another book on the Brown Shirted scourge. It is not an important book; it adds nothing to one's knowledge of the German and European events of the last decade, nor is it a penetrating analysis of the social basis for the rise of Hitlerism. On the contrary, little or nothing is offered in the way of a fundamental explanation of the powerful social forces of disintegrating capitalism and the movements of reaction and despair which it has spewed forth. This book, however, is not written by a professional journalist, a state official, a jobless republican or deposed and frustrated social-democratic politician. It is a sentimental and romanticized biographical picture of the dark decade, interspersed with Catholic and humanistic sermons by a devout and princely German republican of Austrian origin.

Thus, we are taken through the struggle of this courageous prince against the rising Nazi tide, his disappointment at the absence of the will to struggle by the social-democrats, the cruel and barbarous conduct of the victorious fascists in Europe and his own continuous flight. It is not a new story and his adventures are not particularly exciting. They are, as a matter of fact, commonplace, for the Prince had a host of upper class and influential friends in numerous countries, and he had, above all, the means to avoid the extreme hardships of the hundreds of thousands of revolutionary and proletarian exiles.

The book may have interest for those who want to know how a representative of bourgeois democracy with an aristocratic progenitor and strong connections in the Catholic Church lived through the evil days of a Nazi hunt. Aristocratic station, a comfortable amount of money, important connections, all of these help ease the physical strain of zu Loewenstein. His anguish was and is entirely moral and spiritual, based on *his* concepts of Christian principles. Finally, it was possible for him to reach American shores, settle his family and himself comfortably in a decent "middle class" home in New Jersey and to carry on his activities in behalf of a restoration of a bourgeois democratic Europe.

The Prince, like so many others, realizes that the old Europe is an impossibility; that its reconstitution can only mean a repetition of the past. He has his own plan of reconstruction. Again, like many similar plans emanating from the bourgeois liberal and democratic world, his post-war plan is an admixture of utopianism, economic planning on capitalist foundations, and moral regeneration of the Continent on the conception that "What is morally good is reasonable, and what is reasonable is morally good." Having set down this precept, zu Loewenstein can expect a continuation of all the evils about which he has complained, for he has overlooked the reality that this precept forms the basis of universal dispute and struggle which is usually decided by physical and class power!

How does he propose to solve the European question? By the establishment of a Continental Commonwealth, a European patriotism, a Commonwealth judicial system, "interlocking treaties of arbitration," courts of arbitration to settle "national" disputes within the Commonwealth, international student exchange, a central bank and the pooling of currencies, etc. This European state would lay the basis for a future World Republic! And all of this will come (or should) on

the basis of capitalist society, the private ownership of the means of production (monopolized) and production for profit; all of this will rest upon the fundamental traditions of bourgeois economy, upon the economic tendencies engendered by the class nature of this society. For a violation of the bourgeois structure is furthest from the Prince's mind. He has faith and Christian idealism to carry him on! God knows that is little enough comfort.

W. AMADEUS.

Germany from Underground

THE SILENT WAR: THE UNDERGROUND MOVEMENT IN GERMANY, by Stefan Weyl and Jon Jansen. Lip-pincott & Co., Publishers; \$3.00; 357 pages.

It is a little difficult to pass judgment on this book because one is never sure as to exactly what the authors are trying to do. Certainly the performance does not live up to the rather pretentious subtitle; the book is not a history of the underground movement, nor is it an adequate presentation of even a cross-section of that movement. It is rather a confused jumble of a number of things: a little bit of social reportage of life under the Nazis, which is neither very original or profound; a description of what purports to be the organizational practices of the underground, much of which is platitudinous and other parts doubtful and unsubstantiated; an attempt to trace the changing fortunes of the underground with relation to the development of world politics in the past ten years, which is flimsy and threadbare, substituting anecdotes for serious analysis; and finally the pleading of the special case of the group to which the authors belong, the New Beginning group, a left Social-Democratic tendency.

Those who remember the manifesto this group published some five or six years ago are aware of the pedestrian quality of the unique mixture of Social-Democratic and Stalinist politics which it adopted. This political line is developed in the present book, as well; a kind of People's Frontism, a constant blurring of political thought and theoretical perspectives. The war is accepted without question or reservation, not even the Laskian kind of support being put forward. What serious difference this group has from the official Social-Democracy, other than a vague emphasis on the need for activism and militancy, is difficult to see.

One additional point needs to be made. The authors say that the Stalinist underground organization has been virtually smashed because it was ridden with Nazi agents in its important branches. There is no proof of the truth of this assertion, and if it were true, it would not necessarily constitute any condemnation of the Stalinist position. The reason the Stalinists were slaughtered in such large numbers after Hitler's seizure of power was because of their false and criminal estimate of the political situation in Germany: their line that Hitler would last six months and that the path for them would then be clear. This phantasmagorical position led them to the most reckless adventurism, with the result that their best militants were sacrificed. But such a political understanding is a far cry from the gossipy approach of the authors.

Finally one must mention the constant exaggeration and boasting which the authors indulge in. We for one do not believe their "reports" of the size or organizational perfection of their group; we should certainly like to believe it, but the

bitter realities of analysis lead us to the conviction that with the barest possible exception of the Stalinists, there has probably not been any nation-wide underground movement, organized and centralized, such as Weyl and Jansen speak of.

All that we can grant the authors is their patent sincerity and continued socialist adherence. This is no unimportant thing these days. But it's not enough with which to write a book.

ALFRED FREEMAN.

Reviews in Brief:

Finances and the War

FISCAL PLANNING FOR TOTAL WAR, by William L. Crum, John F. Fennelly and Lawrence H. Seltzer. Published by the National Bureau of Economic Research, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. Index, 358 pages.

The National Bureau of Economic Research is a bourgeois organization devoted to a study of economic problems and trends in the United States. It has a competent staff of professionals and researchers in its employ, and its board of directors includes representatives of some of the largest corporations in the country, as well as a representative of the CIO. Additional directors (by appointment) represent some of the leading colleges and universities. The organization has done a considerable amount of important work on American economic and social life—all of it proceeding from the "solid" foundation of bourgeois economy and the interests of capitalism. Its material is, nevertheless, interesting and informative; its contributors competent technicians.

This study is the product of the work of about twenty persons, members of the directing committee, researchers and special consultants. While many books have been published dealing with the question of finance and its mobilization for war, few have the competence of this volume, despite its heavily technical character, in posing the problems of capitalist economy faced with total war.

The book takes you through the problems of production, the decline in the production of consumer goods, the rise of new industries, and the increasing weight of war industries. It deals with the problems of the relation of government to business and the financing of the war by the state. Having stated the problem of the war, the magnitude of production and costs, the book proceeds to discuss the multiple financial problems arising out of a war budget of more than two hundred billion dollars and the means by which this tremendous financial outlay is to be met.

It discusses the problem of production, income and expenditures for the war, the specific rôle of finance, controls, and the vast subject of taxation, corporation, income, direct and indirect, and the more recent proposals of tax collection at source.

A.

A War Labor Problem

WARTIME TRANSFERENCE OF LABOR IN GREAT BRITAIN.
Published by International Labor Office, Montreal, Canada;
163 pages, price \$1.00.

This is an important study of the universal problem of the mobilization of manpower which all warring countries face. In Great Britain it involved the trans-

fer of between four and five million people to new homes and new industries to meet the requirements of fighting a total war.

The initiative for working out such a program was with the government. Together with the big business organizations and the trade union officialdom, an enormous shift of population took place from unimportant (from the point of view of war production) industries to those producing war goods—the heavy metallurgical industries, shipyards and munitions. This mobilization involved not only the available working force, but went into the women and "over-age" labor reserves to provide the necessary labor for new demands. Thus it is estimated that out of a total adult population of 33,000,000, seventy-five per cent are now either in "the armed forces, the war industries or in other work or service."

The problem in Great Britain, however, has not ended with the present mobilization. As a result of the limited population, the problem of continuous shifts to meet new war labor problems is constantly present, and the capitalist state solves it in the only way it can, by constant shocks. The pawn in all these shifts and transfers is the working class, whose remuneration, low to begin with, is "decided" in joint conference between capital, labor and the government!

A study of the experiences of Great Britain is important for Americans, where the problem of manpower and its control are being considered today from a practical point of view.

G.

ANNOUNCEMENT:

Now Ready for Sale

Bound Volume of

The NEW INTERNATIONAL

for the Year 1942

Avail yourself of the opportunity to own a 1942 Bound Set of the OUTSTANDING MARXIST JOURNAL IN THE COUNTRY at the low price of only \$2.50 a volume.

Send Your Orders Now!

THE WORKERS PARTY

114 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y.

Name.....

Address.....

City..... State.....

A LETTER

To the Editor of The New International:

I have just read the February issue of The New International in which there appears a critical review of Frölich's biography of Rosa Luxemburg by Reva Craine. I hasten to send for publication the following comments which, it seems to me, need urgently to be made. The only section of the article that I am concerned with at the present is called "On the Rôle of Accumulation." Reva Craine discusses the Luxemburgian theory of capital accumulation as if it were the accepted theory in the revolutionary movement. She says that Luxemburg did not "merely" defend Marx but "extended" his theories. She fails to state that the "extension" was decisively rejected by Lenin. Since, unfortunately, Lenin's major criticisms are unavailable in English, I take this opportunity of acquainting English readers with them.

Rosa Luxemburg's *Accumulation of Capital* was published in January, 1913. (All references to the book in this letter are from the Russian translation by Dvoilatsky, under the editorship of Bukharin, 1921.) The same year Lenin wrote in his notebooks (published as the *Sborniki*) two outlines of his views on the book. One consists of his comments on various sections of the book, and the other is an outline of an article he evidently intended to write but never completed. However, the following year he did write for the *Encyclopedia Granat* an article, "Karl Marx," which has appeared in English. To this he appended a bibliography in which he describes Luxemburg's book as "an incorrect interpretation of Marxist theory." The comments in the *Leninski Sbornik* (Vol. 22, pp. 343-348) are more extensive. The outline of the article he intended to write follows:

**ROSA LUXEMBURG'S UNSUCCESSFUL SUPPLEMENT
TO MARXIST THEORY**
P. 322

For example:

- I. 14 year ago. The Narodniks against the Marxists. Legal Marxists and Social Democrats.
- II. R. Luxemburg's Perversion.
- III. Posing of the theoretical problem.
- IV. Rosa Luxemburg's ("supplement"). Criticism. Anti-criticism.
- V. Rosa Luxemburg's "supplement." A failure.
- V bis. The German social-democratic press and "squabble."
- VI. Dialectics and eclectics.
- VII. Imperialism and realization of surplus value. (Rothstein, etc.)

Lenin's Notes and Luxemburg's Views

It can be seen from the above that Lenin was absolutely opposed to Rosa's theory. Both in this and throughout his notes on the book he repeatedly refers to his dispute with the Narodniks. I cannot go into that dispute here except to say that its very root was the question of the accumulation of capital, a subject to which Lenin devoted numerous articles and the opening sections of his famous *Development of Capitalism in Russia*. In his marginal notes he constantly refers to the latter.

Rosa Luxemburg herself had no illusion about the relation of her views to Lenin's. She makes many references to Ilyin (the then pseudonym of Lenin) and deals with his polemics against the Narodniks. On pages 222-223 she quotes

Lenin to the effect that the constant growth of constant capital at the expense of variable capital is a characteristic law of capitalist production, and then comments:

Bulgakov, Ilyin and Tugan Baranovsky are greatly mistaken when they declare that with this law they have discovered the specific character of capitalist economy in which production is an aim in itself and individual consumption merely a subsidiary condition.

She argued against the Russian Marxists and tried to find a solution to the conflicting positions on the question of accumulation *between* the two positions, between what she called (pages 256-257): "the petty bourgeois skepticism of Sismondi, Kirchman, Vorontsev and Nikolai—they who considered accumulation impossible—and the vulgar optimism of Ricardo, Say and Tugan Baranovsky for whom capital can endlessly fructify itself."

It must be remembered that the dispute is a *theoretical* one, one which takes place within the framework of Marx's *abstract* capitalism. The dispute revolves around Luxemburg's argument that capitalist accumulation is theoretically impossible unless capitalism can find non-capitalist strata at home and abroad. This Lenin uncompromisingly denies. Lenin does not deny, as no sensible person could, the fact that capitalism seeks foreign markets. But Luxemburg thought that it *must* do so in order to *realize* surplus value. Lenin stated that it *did* so in order to be able to *produce* greater surplus value. All through his comments Lenin's hostility to the specific contention of Luxemburg is manifest. Opposite her sentence: "Capitalism has need of non-capitalist social strata as a market for its surplus value," Lenin remarks "Rubbish" in one place and "Kasha" (mush) in another. That whole section of Luxemburg's book (pp. 312-336) which describes capitalism's pursuit of foreign markets is punctuated by Lenin, thus:

... Capitalism moves to backward lands not for the sake of the realization of surplus value but for the *conveniences* of exploitation, gratuitous labor, etc. The percentage is bigger! That is all. Pillaging of the lands (gifts), loan at 12-13 per cent, etc.—that is where the *root* is.

The root of Rosa's contention was entirely different.

Reva Craine errs not only in depicting the place Luxemburg's book occupies in the Marxist movement, but also in her summation of the theoretical objective of the book. She writes:

On the basis of Marx's formulations on accumulation and extended reproduction, she demonstrates that expansion, without which capitalism cannot exist, proceeds by a vast extension of the world market through penetration into and exploitation of non-capitalist areas. (My emphasis —F.F.)

Rosa Luxemburg, on the other hand, writes (p. 207):

He (Bulgakov) thinks that with the help of these mathematical formulae he resolved the question of accumulation. ... Bulgakov here slavishly follows the Marxist method of investigation and imitates that very incorrect posing of the question, without noticing its incorrectness.

Further (p. 232) Luxemburg emphasizes "the insufficiency of the diagrams at the end of Volume II." She devotes a whole chapter of her book to the *Contradictions in the Schemata of Extended Reproduction*. She concludes (p. 242):

Thus the Marxian diagrams of extended reproduction could not explain the process of accumulation as it occurs in reality and as it develops historically.

In connection with what Reva Craine calls the "formulations" must be considered the diagrams at the end of Volume II of *Capital* because no party in the accumulation dispute ever considered the formulæ except in close connection

with the diagrams. Rosa herself uses "formulæ," "diagrams," "scheme," "schemata" interchangeably. She goes to great lengths to express her disagreement with the theoretical premises of Marx's work on capitalist accumulation in Volume II. (She contended that Marx never finished the work, it was put together from fragments and it did not represent anything like his completed views and, in fact, contradicted Volumes I and III.) She took first of all the diagrams and showed that, taken by themselves they could permit no other interpretation than production for the sake of production, which she called 'an *ad infinitum* vicious circle as expounded by Tugan Baranovsky" (p. 229). However, she then proceeded to quote extensively from all three volumes of *Capital* and from his *Theories of Surplus Value* and concluded (pp. 228-230) that:

...even when Marx speaks of the "actual structure of society," he pays attention exclusively to the participants in the consumption of surplus value and wages, consequently, only to the strata clinging to the basic capitalist categories of production.... Thus there is no doubt at all that Marx wished to describe the process of accumulation in a society composed exclusively of capitalists and workers under the general and exclusive domination of the capitalist method of production. But under these circumstances his formulæ permit no other interpretation than production for production's sake.

With this she violently disagreed. She counters with an attempt to bring in underconsumption: "And thus who realizes the constantly growing surplus value?" (p. 231). And finally, on p. 257, she states her own conclusions emphatically:

Accumulation of capital cannot be conceived, if we presuppose the exclusive and absolute domination of the capitalist method of production; more than that, it is inconceivable in any respect without non-capitalist circles.

It is alongside this passage that Lenin wrote: "The root of the mistake." There can be no reconciliation whatever of his position and Luxemburg's.

Necessity for Clarity

This is by no means an academic question nor one belonging to the distant past. William Blake, in his *An American Looks at Karl Marx*, published in 1939, gives practically twenty pages to Rosa Luxemburg and the "Accumulation" debate. In her recent (1942) *An Essay on Marxian Economics*, Joan Robinson bemoans the fact that Rosa Luxemburg's attempt to make an underconsumptionist of Marx has not been taken seriously in the revolutionary movement. In America the question has been once more reopened by the Stalinist, Paul Sweezy, who, in his *The Theory of Capitalist Development*, although criticizing Luxemburg along the lines of Lenin's criticism, himself makes a desperate attempt to turn the Marxist theory into one of underconsumptionism.

It behooves us to study the problem more thoroughly. It was not my intention in this letter, nor could I possibly in such brief space, detail the full positions of Lenin and Luxemburg. What I have intended to do and what, in my opinion, needs immediately to be done is to counteract the utterly false (and dangerous) impressions Reva Craine gives in her "critical review." No critical reviewer could fail to be aware of the different points of view in this historic debate. Or, at any rate, leave such false impressions as must certainly arise from sentences like the following:

On the basis of *her* theory, Rosa Luxemburg *proved* the inevitability of the collapse of capitalism, that it cannot emerge from its contradictions and continue limitless expansion. (My emphasis.—F. F.)

If Reva Craine accepts Luxemburg's basis, she is, of course, entitled to her opinion but she should, at least, have stated

that Lenin and other great Marxists neither accepted the basis nor thought that the inevitability of the collapse of capitalism could be proved on *that* basis.

Reva Craine further writes:

She (Luxemburg) therefore put socialism on a more scientific footing, stripping it of its last shreds of utopianism.

What, may I ask, were the elements of "utopianism" in Marx's doctrine in general and of accumulation in particular which were eradicated by Luxemburg?

FREDDIE FOREST.



A REPLY

In reply to the somewhat overwrought letter of Freddie Forrest, I want to make a few brief observations.

1—Lenin's disagreement with Luxemburg's *Accumulation* is a universally well known fact, and although it was an omission not to have mentioned it in my review, it certainly is silly to imply in this omission a conspiracy and a "danger."

It is interesting, however, to note that although Lenin promised to write a book against Luxemburg on this question, from 1913, when her book was published, up until his death, he did not do so. This was the period when he wrote *Imperialism: The Last Stage of Capitalism*, in which no reference is made to Luxemburg, although he wrote voluminously against her on all other questions on which the two disagreed.

2—If Freddie Forrest knows the origin of Luxemburg's book, and against whom it was written, she could readily have understood that my reference to "stripping socialism of its last shreds of utopianism" was to the German and Austrian social-patriotic revisionists (Bauer & Co.), who claimed that capitalism would fall not as a result of its own inherent contradictions but as a result of the indignation to which it drives the working class.

3—In her quotations from Luxemburg, Freddie Forrest shows that she herself does not understand what it is that Luxemburg accepted or rejected in Marx, but she does reveal her misconception of Marxian economics by adhering to the erroneous concept that under capitalism, production takes place "for the sake of production."

4—Lenin's rejection of Luxemburg's theory is in and by itself neither a confirmation nor a refutation of it, any more than "kasha" and "rubbish" are theoretic criticisms. An objective discussion on the merits of Luxemburg's book is possible only on the basis of a first-hand knowledge of it, which, I am afraid, neither of us can have at the present time. Any other discussion of this work is presumptuous.

REVA CRAINE.

CORRECTION:

In the article, "An Analysis of Russian Economy," which appeared in the February issue of *THE NEW INTERNATIONAL*, it was erroneously stated that Mme. Litvinov headed the perfume trust, whereas in reality it was Mme. Molotov.

Pre-Publication Announcement!

Now on the Press and Ready for Sale Shortly

The Book That Opened the Struggle Against Stalinism!

THE NEW COURSE

One of the Greatest Writings by

Leon Trotsky

Edited and with an Introduction and Annotated Notes by

MAX SHACHTMAN

Watch for the Opening Date of Sale and Price

PUBLISHED BY THE WORKERS PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

114 WEST 14th STREET

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Have You Seen **LABOR ACTION**

—it's better than ever

featuring stories on

**WAR NEGROES
LABOR WORLD NEWS**

Editorial Comment

LABOR ACTION, 114 W. 14th St., New York, N. Y.

Name.....

Address.....

City..... State.....

RATES: 60 Cents a Year. \$1.00 in Canada,
Foreign and New York City